

भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

साप्ताहिक
WEEKLY

सं. 9] नई दिल्ली, फरवरी 24, 2008—मार्च 1, 2008, शनिवार/फाल्गुन 5—फाल्गुन 11, 1929
No. 9] NEW DELHI, FEBRUARY 24, 2008—MARCH 1, 2008, SATURDAY/PHALGUNA 5—PHALGUNA 11, 1929

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह पुस्तक संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके।

Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation.

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (II)
PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (II)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(Other than the Ministry of Defence)

प्रवासी भारतीय कार्य मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 406.—उत्प्रवास अधिनियम, 1983 (1983 का 31) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार, एतद् द्वारा प्रवासी भारतीय कार्य मंत्रालय में निदेशक श्रीमती शैलजा शर्मा को श्री जगदानन्दा पाण्डा, उत्प्रवास महासंरक्षी की अनुपस्थिति में उत्प्रवास महासंरक्षी के पद का कार्यभार संभालने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है, जो 9 फरवरी, 2008 के अपराह्न से 17 फरवरी, 2008 तक अवकाश पर रहेंगे।

[फा. सं. ए-19011/4/2006-पीए]

वी.के. भाटिया, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF OVERSEAS INDIAN AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2008

S.O. 406.— In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Emigration Act, 1983 (31 of 1983), the Central Government hereby authorizes Smt. Shailja Sharma, Director in the Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs to look after the work of Protector General of Emigrants in the absence on leave of Shri Jagadananda Panda, Protector General of Emigrants, from 09 February, 2008 afternoon to 17th February, 2008.

[F.No. A-19011/4/2006-PA]

V.K. BHATIA, Under Secy.

मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त का कार्यालय

उदयपुर, 14 फरवरी, 2008

सं. 02/2007-08

(आय-कर)

का.आ. 407.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 की 43वां) की धारा 10 के खण्ड (23ग) के उपखण्ड (iv) के साथ पठित आयकर नियमावली, 1962 के नियम 2ग के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, उदयपुर एतद्वारा “सेवा मंदिर, उदयपुर (राजस्थान)” को कर निर्धारण वर्ष 2007-08 से 2009-10 तक के लिए निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए उक्त उप-खण्ड के प्रयोजनार्थ अधिसूचित करते हैं, अर्थात् :-

- (i) कर निर्धारिती अपनी आय का इस्तेमाल अथवा अपनी आय का इस्तेमाल करने के लिए उनका संचयन पूर्णतया तथा अनन्यतया उन उद्देश्यों के लिए करेगा जिनके लिए इसकी स्थापना की गई है;
- (ii) कर निर्धारिती उपर्युक्त कर निर्धारण वर्षों से संगत पूर्ववर्ती वर्षों की किसी भी अवधि के दौरान धारा 11 की उप-धारा (v) में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी एक अथवा एक से अधिक ढंग अथवा भिन्न तरीकों से अपनी निधि (जेवर, जवाहरात, फर्नीचर आदि के रूप में प्राप्त तथा अनुरक्षित स्वैच्छिक अंशदान से भिन्न) का निवेश नहीं करेगा अथवा उसे जमा नहीं करेगा;
- (iii) यह अधिसूचना किसी ऐसी आय के सम्बन्ध में लागू नहीं होगी, जो कि कारोबार से प्राप्त लाभ तथा अभिलाभ हो जब तक कि ऐसा कारोबार उक्त कर निर्धारिती के उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति के प्रासंगिक नहीं हो अथवा ऐसे कारोबार के सम्बन्ध में अलग से लेखा पुस्तिकाएँ नहीं रखी जाती हों;
- (iv) कर निर्धारिती आयकर अधिनियम 1961 के प्रावधानों के अनुसार अपनी आय विवरणी नियमित रूप से आयकर प्राधिकारी के समक्ष दाखिल करेगा;
- (v) विघटन की स्थिति में इसकी अतिरिक्त राशिवाँ और परिसम्पत्तियाँ समान उद्देश्यों वाले धर्मार्थ संगठन को दे दी जायेंगी;

यह अधिसूचना केवल संस्था की ओर से आय के प्राप्तकर्ता पर ही लागू होगी, न कि इस तरह के प्राप्तकर्ता द्वारा किसी अन्य प्राप्ति अथवा आय पर। संस्था के आय की कराधेयता अथवा अन्यथा पर, आयकर अधिनियम 1961 के उपबन्धों के अनुसार पृथक रूप से विचार किया जायेगा।

[सं. मु. आ.आ./उदय/आ.अ.(तक.)/2007-08/2684]

मुकेश भान्ती, मुख्य आयुक्त

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX,

Udaipur, the 14th February, 2008

No. 02/2007-08

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 407.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (iv) of Clause (23C) of Section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) read with rule 2C of the Income-tax Rules, 1962, I, Chief Commissioner of Income-tax, Udaipur hereby notify the “Seva Mandir Udaipur (Rajasthan)” for the purpose of the said sub-clause for the assessment years 2007-08 to 2009-10 subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- (i) The assessee will apply its income, or accumulate for application, wholly and exclusively to the objects for which it is established;
- (ii) The assessee will not invest or deposit its fund (other than voluntary contributions received and maintained in the form of jewellery, furniture etc.) for any period during the previous year relevant to the assessment years mentioned above otherwise than in any one or more of the forms or modes specified in sub-section (5) of Section 11;
- (iii) This notification will not apply in relation to any income being profits and gains of business, unless the business is incidental to the attainment of the objectives of the assessee and separate books of accounts are maintained in respect of such business;
- (iv) The assessee will regularly file its return of income before the Income-tax authority in accordance with the provisions of the Income Tax Act, 1961;
- (v) That in the event of dissolution, its surplus and the assets will be given to a charitable organization with similar objectives;

This notification is applicable only to the recipients of income on behalf of the assessee and not to any other receipt or income of such recipients. Taxability or, otherwise of the income of the assessee would be separately considered as per the provisions of the Income Tax Act, 1961.

[No. CCIT/UDR/ITO (Tech.)/2007-08/2684]

MUKESH BHANTI, Chief Commissioner

उदयपुर, 14 फरवरी, 2008

सं. 03/2007-08

(आय-कर)

का.आ. 408.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 की 43 वां) की धारा 10 के खण्ड (23ग) की उपखण्ड (iv) के साथ पठित आयकर नियमावली, 1962 के नियम 2ग के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, उदयपुर एतद्वारा “सेवा मंदिर, उदयपुर (राजस्थान)” को कर निर्धारण वर्ष 2001-02 से 2003-04 तक के लिए निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए उक्त उपखण्ड के प्रयोजनार्थ अधिसूचित करते हैं, अर्थात् :-

- (i) कर निर्धारिती अपनी आय का इस्तेमाल अथवा अपनी आय का इस्तेमाल करने के लिए उनका संचयन पूर्णतया तथा अनन्यतया उन उद्देश्यों के लिए करेगा जिनके लिए इसकी स्थापना की गई है;
- (ii) कर निर्धारिती उपर्युक्त कर निर्धारण वर्षों से संगत पूर्ववर्ती वर्षों की किसी भी अवधि के दौरान धारा 11 की उपधारा (v) में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी एक अथवा एक से अधिक ढंग अथवा भिन्न तरीकों से अपनी निधि (ज्वेरा, जवाहरात, फर्नीचर आदि के रूप में प्राप्त तथा अनुरक्षित स्वैच्छिक अंशदान से भिन्न) का निवेश नहीं करेगा अथवा उसे जमा नहीं करेगा;
- (iii) यह अधिसूचना किसी ऐसी आय के सम्बन्ध में लागू नहीं होगी, जो कि कारोबार से प्राप्त लाभ तथा अभिलाभ हो जब तक कि ऐसा कारोबार उक्त कर निर्धारिती के उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति के प्रासंगिक नहीं हो अथवा ऐसे कारोबार के सम्बन्ध में अलग से लेखा पुस्तिकाएं नहीं रखी जाती हों;
- (iv) कर निर्धारिती आयकर अधिनियम 1961 के प्रावधानों के अनुसार अपनी आय विवरणी नियमित रूप से आयकर प्राधिकारी के समक्ष दाखिल करेगा;
- (v) विघटन की स्थिति में इसकी अतिरिक्त राशियां और परिसम्पत्तियां समान उद्देश्यों वाले धर्मार्थ संगठन को दे दी जायेंगी;

यह अधिसूचना केवल संस्था की ओर से आय के प्राप्तकर्ता पर ही लागू होगी न कि इस तरह के प्राप्तकर्ता द्वारा किसी अन्य प्राप्ति अथवा आय पर। संस्था के आय की कराधेयता अथवा अन्यथा पर, आयकर अधिनियम 1961 के उपबन्धों के अनुसार पृथक रूप से विचार किया जायेगा।

[सं. मु. आ.आ/उदय/आ.अ.(तक.)/2007-08/2685]

मुकेश भान्ती, मुख्य आयुक्त

Udaipur, the 14th February, 2008

No. 03/2007-08

(Income-tax)

S.O. 408.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (iv) of Clause (23C) of Section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) read with rule 2C of the Income-tax Rules, 1962, I, Chief Commissioner of Income-tax, Udaipur hereby notify the “Seva Mandir Udaipur (Rajasthan)” for the purpose of the said sub-clause for the assessment years 2001-02 to 2003-04 subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- (i) The assessee will apply its income, or accumulate for application, wholly and exclusively to the objects for which it is established;
- (ii) The assessee will not invest or deposit its fund (other than voluntary contributions received and maintained in the form of jewellery, furniture etc.) for any period during the previous year relevant to the assessment years mentioned above otherwise than in any one or more of the forms or modes specified in sub-section (5) of Section 11;
- (iii) This notification will not apply in relation to any income being profits and gains of business, unless the business is incidental to the attainment of the objectives of the assessee and separate books of accounts are maintained in respect of such business;
- (iv) The assessee will regularly file its return of income before the Income-tax authority in accordance with the provisions of the Income Tax Act, 1961;
- (v) That in the event of dissolution, its surplus and the assets will be given to a charitable organization with similar objectives;

This notification is applicable only to the recipients of income on behalf of the assessee and not to any other receipt or income of such recipients. Taxability or, otherwise of the income of the assessee would be separately considered as per the provisions of the Income Tax Act, 1961.

[No. CCIT/UDR/ITO(Tech.)/2007-08/2685]

MUKESH BHANTI, Chief Commissioner

उदयपुर, 14 फरवरी, 2008

सं. 04/2007-08

(आय-कर)

का.आ. 409.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 की 43 वां) की धारा 10 के खण्ड (23ग) की उपखण्ड (iv) के साथ प्रदत्त आयकर नियमावली, 1962 के नियम 2ग के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, उदयपुर एतद्वारा "महाराणा प्रताप स्मारक समिति, मोती मगरी, उदयपुर (राजस्थान)" को कर निर्धारण वर्ष 2005-06 से 2007-08 तक के लिए निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए उक्त उपखण्ड के प्रयोजनार्थ अधिसूचित करते हैं, अर्थात् :-

- (i) कर निर्धारिती अपनी आय का इस्तेमाल अथवा अपनी आय का इस्तेमाल करने के लिए उनका संचयन पूर्णतया तथा अनन्यतया उन उद्देश्यों के लिए करेगा जिनके लिए इसकी स्थापना की गई है;
- (ii) कर निर्धारिती उपर्युक्त कर निर्धारण वर्षों से संगत पूर्ववर्ती वर्षों की किसी भी अवधि के दौरान धारा 11 की उपधारा (v) में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी एक अथवा एक से अधिक ढंग अथवा भिन्न तरीकों से अपनी निधि (जैवर, जवाहरात, फर्नीचर आदि के रूप में प्राप्त तथा अनुरक्षित स्वैच्छिक अंशदान से भिन्न) का निवेश नहीं करेगा अथवा उसे जमा नहीं करेगा;
- (iii) यह अधिसूचना किसी ऐसी आय के सम्बन्ध में लागू नहीं होगी, जो कि कारोबार से प्राप्त लाभ तथा अभिलाभ हो जब तक कि ऐसा कारोबार उक्त कर निर्धारिती के उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति के प्रासंगिक नहीं हो अथवा ऐसे कारोबार के सम्बन्ध में अलग से लेखा पुस्तिकाएं नहीं रखी जाती हों;
- (iv) कर निर्धारिती आयकर अधिनियम 1961 के प्रावधानों के अनुसार अपनी आय विवरणी नियमित रूप से आयकर प्राधिकारी के समक्ष दाखिल करेगा;
- (v) विघटन की स्थिति में इसकी अतिरिक्त राशियां और परिसम्पत्तियां समान उद्देश्यों वाले धर्मार्थ संगठन को दे दी जायेंगी;

यह अधिसूचना केवल संस्था की ओर से आय के प्राप्तकर्ता पर ही लागू होगी न कि इस तरह के प्राप्तकर्ता द्वारा किसी अन्य प्राप्ति अथवा आय पर। संस्था के आय की कराधेयता अथवा अन्यथा पर, आयकर अधिनियम 1961 के उपबन्धों के अनुसार पृथक रूप से विचार किया जायेगा।

[सं. मु. आ.आ/उदय/आ.अ.(तक.)/2007-08/2681]

मुकेश भान्ती, मुख्य आयुक्त

Udaipur, the 14th February, 2008

No. 04/2007-08

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 409.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (iv) of Clause (23C) of Section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) read with rule 2C of the Income-tax Rules, 1962, I, Chief Commissioner of Income-tax, Udaipur hereby notify the "Maharana Pratap Smarak Samiti, Moti Magri, Udaipur (Rajasthan)" for the purpose of the said sub-clause for the assessment years 2005-06 to 2007-08 subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- (i) The assessee will apply its income, or accumulate for application, wholly and exclusively to the objects for which it is established;
- (ii) The assessee will not invest or deposit its fund (other than voluntary contributions received and maintained in the form of jewellery, furniture etc.) for any period during the previous year relevant to the assessment years mentioned above otherwise than in any one or more of the forms or modes specified in sub-section (5) of section 11;
- (iii) This notification will not apply in relation to any income being profits and gains of business, unless the business is incidental to the attainment of the objectives of the assessee and separate books of accounts are maintained in respect of such business;
- (iv) The assessee will regularly file its return of income before the Income-tax authority in accordance with the provisions of the Income Tax Act, 1961;
- (v) That in the event of dissolution, its surplus and the assets will be given to a charitable organization with similar objectives;

This notification is applicable only to the recipients of income on behalf of the assessee and not to any other receipt or income of such recipients. Taxability or, otherwise of the income of the assessee would be separately considered as per the provisions of the Income Tax Act, 1961.

[No. CCIT/UDR/ITO (Tech.)/2007-08/2681]

MUKESH BHANTI, Chief Commissioner

उदयपुर, 14 फरवरी, 2008

(सं. 05/2007-08)

(आय-कर)

का.आ. 410.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43 वां) की धारा 10 के खण्ड (23ग) के उपखण्ड (iv) के साथ पठित आयकर नियमावली, 1962 के नियम 2ग के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, उदयपुर एतद्वारा “वेस्ट जोन कल्चरल सेन्टर, गणगौर घाट, उदयपुर (राजस्थान)” को कर निर्धारण वर्ष 2004-05 से 2006-07 तक के लिए निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए उक्त उपखण्ड के प्रयोजनार्थ अधिसूचित करते हैं, अर्थात् :-

- (i) कर निर्धारिती अपनी आय का इस्तेमाल अथवा अपनी आय का इस्तेमाल करने के लिए उनका संचयन पूर्णतया तथा अनन्यतया उन उद्देश्यों के लिए करेगा जिनके लिए इसकी स्थापना की गई है;
- (ii) कर निर्धारिती उपर्युक्त कर निर्धारण वर्षों से संगत पूर्ववर्ती वर्षों की किसी भी अवधि के दौरान धारा 11 की उपधारा (v) में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी एक अथवा एक से अधिक ढंग अथवा भिन्न तरीकों से अपनी निधि (जेवर, जवाहरात, फर्नीचर आदि के रूप में प्राप्त तथा अनुरक्षित स्वेच्छिक अंशदान से भिन्न) का निवेश नहीं करेगा अथवा उसे जमा नहीं करेगा;
- (iii) यह अधिसूचना किसी ऐसी आय के सम्बन्ध में लागू नहीं होगी, जो कि कारोबार से प्राप्त लाभ तथा अभिलाभ हो जब तक कि ऐसा कारोबार उक्त कर निर्धारिती के उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति के प्रासंगिक नहीं हो अथवा ऐसे कारोबार के सम्बन्ध में अलग से लेखा पुस्तिकाएँ नहीं रखी जाती हों;
- (iv) कर निर्धारिती आयकर अधिनियम 1961 के प्रावधानों के अनुसार अपनी आय विवरणी नियमित रूप से आयकर प्राधिकारी के समक्ष दाखिल करेगा;
- (v) विघटन की स्थिति में इसकी अतिरिक्त राशियाँ और परिसम्पत्तियाँ समान उद्देश्यों वाले धर्मार्थ संगठन को दे दी जायेंगी;

यह अधिसूचना केवल संस्था की ओर से आय के प्राप्तकर्ता पर ही लागू होगी न कि इस तरह के प्राप्तकर्ता द्वारा किसी अन्य प्राप्ति अथवा आय पर। संस्था के आय की कराधेयता अथवा अन्यथा पर, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 के उपबन्धों के अनुसार पृथक् रूप से विचार किया जायेगा।

[सं. मु. आ.आ./उदय/आ.अ. (तक.)/2007-08/2683]

मुकेश भान्ती, मुख्य आयुक्त

Udaipur, the 14th February, 2008)

(No. 05/2007-08)

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 410.— In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (iv) of Clause (23C) of Section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) read with rule 2C of the Income-tax Rules, 1962, I, Chief Commissioner of Income-tax, Udaipur hereby notify the “West Zone Cultural Centre, Gangaur Ghat, Udaipur (Rajasthan)” for the purpose of the said sub-clause for the assessment years 2004-05 to 2006-2007 subject to the following conditions, namely:—

- (i) The assessee will apply its income, or accumulate for application, wholly and exclusively to the objects for which it is established;
- (ii) The assessee will not invest or deposit its fund (other than voluntary contributions received and maintained in the form of jewellery, furniture etc.) for any period during the previous year relevant to the assessment years mentioned above otherwise than in any one or more of the forms or modes specified in sub-section (5) of Section 11;
- (iii) This notification will not apply in relation to any income being profits and gains of business, unless the business is incidental to the attainment of the objectives of the assessee and separate books of accounts are maintained in respect of such business;
- (iv) The assessee will regularly file its return of income before the income-tax authority in accordance with the provisions of the Income Tax Act, 1961;
- (v) That in the event of dissolution, its surplus and the assets will be given to a charitable organization with similar objectives;

This notification is applicable only to the recipients of income on behalf of the assessee and not to any other receipt or income of such recipients. Taxability or, otherwise of the income of the assessee would be separately considered as per the provisions of the Income Tax Act, 1961.

[No. CCIT/UDR/ITO (Tech.)/2007-08/2683]

MUKESH BHANTI, Chief Commissioner

उदयपुर, 14 फरवरी, 2008

(सं.-06/2007-08)

(आय-कर)

का.आ. 411.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 की 43 वां) की धारा 10 के खण्ड (23ग) की उपखण्ड (iv) के साथ पठित आयकर नियमावली, 1962 के नियम 2ग के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, उदयपुर एतद्वारा “वेस्ट जोन कल्चरल सेन्टर, गणगौर घाट, उदयपुर (राजस्थान)” को कर निर्धारण वर्ष 2007-08 से 2009-10 तक के लिए निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए उक्त उपखण्ड के प्रयोजनार्थ अधिसूचित करते हैं, अर्थात् :-

- (i) कर निर्धारिती अपनी आय का इस्तेमाल अथवा अपनी आय का इस्तेमाल करने के लिए उनका संचयन पूर्णतया तथा अनन्यतया उन उद्देश्यों के लिए करेगा जिनके लिए इसकी स्थापना की गई है;
- (ii) कर निर्धारिती उपर्युक्त कर निर्धारण वर्षों से संगत पूर्ववर्ती वर्षों की किसी भी अवधि के दौरान धारा 11 की उपधारा (v) में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी एक अथवा एक से अधिक ढंग अथवा भिन्न तरीकों से अपनी निधि (जेवर, जवाहरात, फर्नीचर आदि के रूप में प्राप्त तथा अनुरक्षित स्वैच्छिक अंशदान से भिन्न) का निवेश नहीं करेगा अथवा उसे जमा नहीं करेगा;
- (iii) यह अधिसूचना किसी ऐसी आय के सम्बन्ध में लागू नहीं होगी, जो कि कारोबार से प्राप्त लाभ तथा अभिलाम हो जब तक कि ऐसा कारोबार उक्त कर निर्धारिती के उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति के प्रासंगिक नहीं हो अथवा ऐसे कारोबार के सम्बन्ध में अलग से लेखा पुस्तिकाएँ नहीं रखी जाती हों;
- (iv) कर निर्धारिती आयकर अधिनियम 1961 के प्रावधानों के अनुसार अपनी आय विवरणी नियमित रूप से आयकर प्राधिकारी के समक्ष दाखिल करेगा;
- (v) विघटन की स्थिति में इसकी अतिरिक्त राशियाँ और परिसम्पत्तियाँ समान उद्देश्यों वाले धर्मार्थ संगठन को दे दी जायेगी;

यह अधिसूचना केवल संस्था की ओर से आय के प्राप्तकर्ता पर ही लागू होगी न कि इस तरह के प्राप्तकर्ता द्वारा किसी अन्य प्राप्ति अथवा धार पर। संस्था के आय की कराधेयता अथवा अन्यथा पर, आयकर अधिनियम 1961 के उपबन्धों के अनुसार पृथक रूप से विचार किया जायेगा।

[सं. मु. आ.आ/उदय/आ.अ.(तक.)/2007-08/2682]

मुकेश भान्ती, मुख्य आयुक्त

Udaipur, the 14th February, 2008

(No. 06/2007-08)

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 411.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (iv) of Clause (23C) of Section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) read with rule 2C of the Income-tax Rules, 1962, I, Chief Commissioner of Income-tax, Udaipur hereby notify the “West Zone Cultural Centre, Gangaur Ghat, Udaipur (Rajasthan)” for the purpose of the said sub-clause for the assessment years 2007-08 to 2009-10 subject to the following conditions, namely:

- (i) The assessee will apply its income, or accumulate for application, wholly and exclusively to the objects for which it is established;
- (ii) The assessee will not invest or deposit its fund (other than voluntary contributions received and maintained in the form of jewellery, furniture etc.) for any period during the previous year relevant to the assessment years mentioned above otherwise than in any one or more of the forms or modes specified in sub-section (5) of Section 11;
- (iii) This notification will not apply in relation to any income being profits and gains of business, unless the business is incidental to the attainment of the objectives of the assessee and separate books of accounts are maintained in respect of such business;
- (iv) The assessee will regularly file its return of income before the Income-tax authority in accordance with the provisions of the Income Tax Act, 1961;
- (v) That in the event of dissolution, its surplus and the assets will be given to a charitable organization with similar objectives;

This notification is applicable only to the recipients of income on behalf of the assessee and not to any other receipt or income of such recipients. Taxability or, otherwise of the income of the assessee would be separately considered as per the provisions of the Income Tax Act, 1961.

[No. CCIT/UDR/ITO (Tech.)/2007-08/2682]

MUKESH BHANTI, Chief Commissioner

उदयपुर, 18 फरवरी, 2008

सं.-07/2007-08

(आय-कर)

का.आ. 412.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 की 43 वां) की धारा 10 के खण्ड (23ग) की उपखण्ड (iv) के साथ पठित आयकर नियमावली, 1962 के नियम 2ग के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, उदयपुर एतद्वारा “कृष्ण गोपाल आयुर्वेदिक धर्मार्थ औषधालय ट्रस्ट पी.ओ. कलेरा कृष्ण गोपाल जिला--अजमेर (राजस्थान)” को कर निर्धारण वर्ष 2007-08 से 2009-10 तक के लिए निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए उक्त उपखण्ड के प्रयोजनार्थ अधिसूचित करते हैं, अर्थात् :-

- (i) कर निर्धारिती अपनी आय का इस्तेमाल अथवा अपनी आय का इस्तेमाल करने के लिए उनका संचयन पूर्णतया तथा अनन्यतया उन उद्देश्यों के लिए करेगा जिनके लिए इसकी स्थापना की गई है;
- (ii) कर निर्धारिती उपर्युक्त कर निर्धारण वर्षों से संगत पूर्ववर्ती वर्षों की किसी भी अवधि के दौरान धारा 11 की उपधारा (v) में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी एक अथवा एक से अधिक ढंग अथवा भिन्न तरीकों से अपनी निधि (जेवर, जवाहरात, फर्नीचर आदि के रूप में प्राप्त तथा अनुरक्षित स्वैच्छिक अंशदान से भिन्न) का निवेश नहीं करेगा अथवा उसे जमा नहीं करेगा;
- (iii) यह अधिसूचना किसी ऐसी आय के सम्बन्ध में लागू नहीं होगी, जो कि कारोबार से प्राप्त लाभ तथा अभिलाभ हो जब तक कि ऐसा कारोबार उक्त कर निर्धारिती के उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति के प्रासंगिक नहीं हो अथवा ऐसे कारोबार के सम्बन्ध में अलग से लेखा पुस्तिकाएं नहीं रखी जाती हों;
- (iv) कर निर्धारिती आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 के प्रावधानों के अनुसार अपनी आय विवरणी नियमित रूप से आयकर प्राधिकारी के समक्ष दाखिल करेगा;
- (v) विघटन की स्थिति में इसकी अतिरिक्त राशियां और परिसम्पतियां समान उद्देश्यों वाले धर्मार्थ संगठन को दे दी जायेंगी;

यह अधिसूचना केवल संस्था की ओर से आय के प्राप्तकर्ता पर ही लागू होगी न कि इस तरह के प्राप्तकर्ता द्वारा किसी अन्य प्राप्ति अथवा आय पर। संस्था के आय की कराधेयता अथवा अन्यथा पर, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 के उपबन्धों के अनुसार पृथक रूप से विचार किया जायेगा।

[सं. मु. आ.आ./उदय/आ.अ.(तक.)/2007-08/2686]

मुकेश भान्ती, मुख्य आयुक्त

Udaipur, the 18th February, 2008

No. 07/2007-08

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 412.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (iv) of Clause (23C) of Section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) read with rule 2C of the Income-tax Rules, 1962, I, Chief Commissioner of Income-tax, Udaipur hereby notify the “Krishna Gopal Ayurvedic Dharmarth Aushdhalaya Trust P.O. Kalera Krishna Gopal Dist., Ajmer (Rajasthan)” for the purpose of the said sub-clause for the assessment years 2007-08 to 2009-10 subject to the following conditions, namely.—

- (i) The assessee will apply its income, or accumulate for application, wholly and exclusively to the objects for which it is established;
- (ii) The assessee will not invest or deposit its fund (other than voluntary contributions received and maintained in the form of jewellery, furniture etc.) for any period during the previous year relevant to the assessment years mentioned above otherwise than in any one or more of the forms or modes specified in sub-section (5) of section 11;
- (iii) This notification will not apply in relation to any income being profits and gains of business, unless the business is incidental to the attainment of the objectives of the assessee and separate books of accounts are maintained in respect of such business;
- (iv) The assessee will regularly file its return of income before the Income-tax authority in accordance with the provisions of the Income Tax Act, 1961;
- (v) That in the event of dissolution, its surplus and the assets will be given to a charitable organization with similar objectives;

This notification is applicable only to the recipients of income on behalf of the assessee and not to any other receipt or income of such recipients. Taxability or, otherwise of the income of the assessee would be separately considered as per the provisions of the Income Tax Act, 1961.

[No. CCIT/UDR/ITO (Tech.)/2007-08/2686]

MUKESH BHANTI, Chief Commissioner

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

(केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क आयुक्तालय, प्रथम)

जयपुर, 21 फरवरी, 2008

सं. 01-सीमा शुल्क (एन टी) 2008

का.आ. 413.—सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 152 के खण्ड (ए) के तहत भारत सरकार, वित्त मंत्रालय, राजस्व विभाग, नई दिल्ली की अधिसूचना संख्या 33/94 सीमा शुल्क (एन टी) दिनांक प्रथम जुलाई, 1994 के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैं, डॉ. डी.के. वर्मा, आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, जयपुर-प्रथम एतद्वारा, सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम की धारा 9 के अन्तर्गत राजस्थान राज्य के अलवर जिले की तिजारा तहसील में औद्योगिक क्षेत्र, खुशखेड़ा को, शतप्रतिशत ई.ओ.यू. स्थापित करने के उद्देश्य हेतु इस अधिसूचना के जारी होने की तिथि से भण्डारण स्टेशन (वेयर हाउसिंग स्टेशन) घोषित करता हूँ।

[फा. सं. : पंचम (16) तक/सी.शु./01/2008/284]

डॉ. डी.के. वर्मा, आयुक्त

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

(OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER CENTRAL EXCISE-1)

Jaipur, the 21st February, 2008

No. 01-CUS(NT)2008

S.O. 413.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Notification No. 33/94-Customs (NT), dated the 1st July, 1994, by the Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue, New Delhi, issued under clause (a) of Section 152 of Customs Act, 1962, I, Dr. D.K. Verma, Commissioner of Central Excise, Jaipur-I, hereby declare the Industrial Area, Khushkhera, Tehsil-Tijara, Distt. Alwar, in the State of Rajasthan to be warehousing station with effect from date of issue of this notification under Section 9 of the Customs Act, 1962 for the purpose of setting up 100% E.O.U.

[C. No. V (16) Tech/Cus./01/2008/284]

Dr. D.K. VERMA, Commissioner

जयपुर, 21 फरवरी, 2008

सं. : 02-सीमा शुल्क (एन टी) 2008

का.आ. 414.—सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 152 के खण्ड (ए) के तहत भारत सरकार, वित्त मंत्रालय, राजस्व विभाग, नई दिल्ली की अधिसूचना संख्या 33/94 सीमा शुल्क (एन टी) दिनांक प्रथम जुलाई, 1994 के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैं, डॉ. डी.के. वर्मा, आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, जयपुर-प्रथम एतद्वारा, सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम की धारा 9 के अन्तर्गत राजस्थान राज्य के अलवर जिले की तिजारा तहसील में ग्राम केहरानी को, शतप्रतिशत ई.ओ.यू. स्थापित करने के उद्देश्य हेतु इस अधिसूचना के जारी होने की तिथि से भण्डारण स्टेशन (वेयर हाउसिंग स्टेशन) घोषित करता हूँ।

[फा. सं. : पंचम (16) तक/सी.शु./01/2008/143]

डॉ. डी.के. वर्मा, आयुक्त

Jaipur, the 21st February, 2008

No. 02-CUS(NT)2008

S.O. 414.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Notification No. 33/94-Customs (NT), dated the 1st July, 1994, by the Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue, New Delhi, issued under clause (a) of Section 152 of Customs Act, 1962, I, Dr. D.K. Verma, Commissioner of Central Excise, Jaipur-I, hereby declare the Village Kehrani, Tehsil-Tijara, Distt. Alwar, in the State of Rajasthan to be warehousing station with effect from date of issue of this notification under Section 9 of the Customs Act, 1962 for the purpose of setting up 100% E.O.U.

[C. No. V (16) Tech/Cus./01/2008/143]

Dr. D.K. VERMA, Commissioner

(वित्तीय सेवाएं विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 21 फरवरी, 2008

का.ओ. 415.—केंद्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप नियम (4) के अनुसरण में, संलग्न अनुबंध में निम्नलिखित बैंकों/वित्तीय संस्थाओं/बीमा कंपनियों के सूचीबद्ध शाखाओं/कार्यालयों को, जिनके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक होने प्राप्ति कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है :-

क्रम सं.	बैंक/बीमा कंपनियों/वित्तीय संस्थाओं के नाम	शाखाओं/कार्यालयों की संख्या
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	ओरियंटल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स	114
2.	केनरा बैंक	126
3.	सिंडिकेट बैंक	70
4.	युनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया	14
5.	पंजाब नेशनल बैंक	34
6.	इंडियन बैंक	02
7.	स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला	87
8.	युनाइटेड इंडिया इश्योरेंस कंपनी लिमिटेड	05
कुल		452

[फा. सं. 11016/2/2008-हिंदी]

रमेशबाबू अणियेरी, संयुक्त निदेशक (राजभाषा)

अनुबन्ध

ओरियंटल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स

लखनऊ क्षेत्र

- ओरियंटल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
होटल गोनाई, सिविल लाईन
गोण्डा-271001
- ओरियंटल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
प्लॉट नं. सी-459
आवास विकास कालोनी
एल.आई.सी. के सामने
हरदोई-241001
- ओरियंटल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
एपीएस अकडमी
सैनानी विहार, हैबतमऊ मवैया,
राय बरेली रोड,
लखनऊ-226025

- ओरियंटल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
स्टेट प्लाजा, सहारा एस्टेट
जौनकीपुरम्, लखनऊ-226023
- ओरियंटल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
स्वामी विवेकानंद इंटर कॉलेज
अशियाना रोड, सैक्टर-के
लखनऊ-226012
- ओरियंटल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
उत्तर प्रदेश गन्ना किसान संस्था
11, बटलर प्लेस, तिलक मार्ग,
डालीबाग, लखनऊ-226001
- ओरियंटल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
हनुमान प्रसाद रस्तोगी भाष्यमिक कन्या
महाविद्यालय, सुभाष मार्ग
लखनऊ-226003
- ओरियंटल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
रामा देवी बालिका इंटर कॉलेज
497, मीरापुर, इलाहाबाद-211002
- ओरियंटल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
धर्मसंघ शिक्षा मंडल
दुर्गाकुण्ड, वाराणसी-221010
- ओरियंटल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
चित्रा इंटर कॉलेज, 81, वाई ब्लॉक,
हमीर पुर रोड, नौबस्ता, कानपुर
- ओरियंटल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
उत्तर प्रदेश आवास विकास परिषद्
योजना नं. 1, एच.आई.जी.-131,
कल्याणपुर, कानपुर-208024
- ओरियंटल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
पी.बी.एन. कॉलेज,
डी-587, करगिल पेट्रोल पंप के सामने
बाड़ा 8, कानपुर-208027
- ओरियंटल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
एच.एन. इंटर कॉलेज
हरजिन्दर नगर, कानपुर-208007
- ओरियंटल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
उमा नाथ सिंह इंस्टीट्यूट
वीबीएस पूर्वांचल यूनिवर्सिटी कैम्पस
जौनपुर-222001

देहरादून क्षेत्र

- ओरियंटल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
इंस्टीट्यूट ऑफ मैनेजमेंट स्टडीज
21, न्यू कैंट रोड
देहरादून-248001

16. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
57/1-एस, आर्य शॉपिंग कॉम्प्लेक्स
ह्रीदरा नगर कालोनी,
वसंत विहार, फेज-1
देहरादून-248006
 17. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
ए-160, नेहरू कालोनी,
देहरादून-248001
 18. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
साकेत 78, राजपुर रोड
देहरादून-248002
 19. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
पटेल नगर, सहारनपुर रोड
देहरादून-248001
 20. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
नगर पालिका परिषद्
मायापुर हरिद्वार पिन : -249401
 21. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
चिन्मय डिग्री कालेज
शिवालिक नगर,
भेल रानीपुर रोड
हरिद्वार-249403
 22. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
राना मार्केट, मेन रोड
जलालाबाद,
तहसील शामली
जिला : मुजफ्फरनगर
पिन-247772
 23. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
क्रिकेट पुलिस थाना
बद्रीनाथ मार्ग, कोटद्वार
(जिला: पौड़ी गढ़वाल)
पिन: 246149
 24. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
ग्राम व डाकघर : सिखेड़ा,
मीरापुर जानसठ रोड,
तहसील : जानसठ
जिला : मुजफ्फरनगर
पिन-247777
 25. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
सहारनपुर रोड
पेट्रोल पंप के सामने
हरबर्टपुर, जिला : देहरादून
 26. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
जिला समन्वयक कार्यालय
शांति भवन, अम्बाला रोड
सहारनपुर-247001
- गाजियाबाद क्षेत्र
27. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
आई.एम.एस. लाल कुआँ
गाजियाबाद-201001
 28. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
आर्यन पब्लिक स्कूल
सेक्टर-4, वैशाली
गाजियाबाद-201010
 29. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
दिवाकर मॉडल स्कूल
श्याम पार्क एक्सटेंशन
साहिबाबाद, गाजियाबाद-201005
 30. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
मेवाड़ इंस्टिट्यूट ऑफ मैनेजमेंट
सेक्टर-4 सी, वसुंधरा
गाजियाबाद-201001
 31. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
वी.आई.ई.टी.,
ग्राम बील अकबरपुर दादरी
गाजियाबाद बुलंदशहर रोड
जिला : गौतमबुद्ध नगर
गाजियाबाद-201002
 32. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
ग्राम किनौनी, ब्लॉक रोहटा
फैक्टरी परिसर,
मै. बाजाज हिंदुस्तान लि., जिला : मेरठ
गाजियाबाद-250342
 33. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
12 फील्ड रेजीमेंट, तोपखाना
मेरठ कैंट पिन : 250001
 34. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
लोकप्रिय नर्सिंग होम
सम्राट पैलेस, गढ़ रोड,
मेरठ पिन-250004
 35. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
सुभारती डेन्टल कॉलेज
बाई पास रोड, दिल्ली मसूरी हाईवे
मेरठ-250004

36. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
ए.पी.जे. स्कूल सेक्टर-16ए, नोएडा
जिला : गौतम बुद्ध नगर
पिन: 201301
37. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
एलायंस इंटरनेशनल स्कूल
सी-54ए, सेक्टर-56, नोएडा
जिला : गौतम बुद्ध नगर
पिन: 201301
38. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
शॉप नं. 29-30
जिला न्यायालय परिसर, फेज-2, नोएडा
जिला : गौतम बुद्ध नगर
पिन: 201301
39. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
जी-57, 58 सेक्टर-18, नोएडा
जिला : गौतम बुद्ध नगर
पिन: 201301
40. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
ए-211, सेक्टर-ए/4,
ट्रोनिका सिटी जिला : गाजियाबाद
पिन: 201102
41. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
चौहान चौक, हस्तिनापुर रोड
निकट पुलिस चौकी, मवाना
जिला : मेरठ पिन: 250401
42. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
प्लॉट नं. 512, नीति खंड-1
इंद्रापुरम, जिला : गाजियाबाद
पिन: 201001
43. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
शॉप नं. 16, 12-वी मार्किट
सेक्टर-34, नोएडा पिन: 201301
44. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
सी-1, सेक्टर-61, नोएडा
जिला : गौतम बुद्ध नगर
पिन: 201301
45. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
आई.ई.एम.एल.
प्लॉट नं. 25, 27, 28 व 29
द्वितीय नॉलेज पार्क, ग्रेटर नोएडा
जिला : गौतम बुद्ध नगर
पिन: 201305
46. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
मुद्रा पेटिका भूतल, बैंक साइड, के.जे.-13
कवि नगर, गाजियाबाद-201002
47. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
जिला समन्वयक कार्यालय
प्रथम मंजिल, के.जे.-13ए कविनगर
गाजियाबाद पिन: 201002
48. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
जिला समन्वयक कार्यालय
सदर बाजार, मेरठ कैंट
पिन: 250002
- नई दिल्ली क्षेत्र
49. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
मार्डन स्कूल, वसंत विहार
नई दिल्ली-110057
50. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
प्लॉट नं. 20, पहली मंजिल,
सेंट्रल मार्किट
सेक्टर-10, द्वारका
नई दिल्ली-110075
51. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
एन.के. बगरीडिया पब्लिक स्कूल
सेक्टर-4, द्वारका
नई दिल्ली-110078
52. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
एम.आर. विवेकानंद मॉडल स्कूल
सेक्टर-13, द्वारका नई दिल्ली-110078
53. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
डी.ए.वी. पब्लिक स्कूल
कैलाश हिल्स, नई दिल्ली-110065
54. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
दीन दयाल उपाध्याय कॉलेज
शिवाजी मार्ग, कर्मपुरा
नई दिल्ली-110015
55. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
एम.आर. विवेकानंद मॉडल स्कूल
डब्ल्यू जेड-79 सी, मुखराम पार्क
तिलक नगर,
नई दिल्ली-110018
56. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
टैगोर स्कूल 18, मायापुरी रोड
नई दिल्ली-110064

57. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
एम.एस.डी. फ्लैट्स मिन्टो रोड कॉम्प्लेक्स,
नई दिल्ली-110067

58. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
बी-1/ए-14, मोहन को-ऑप. इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट,
मथुरा रोड. नई दिल्ली-110076

59. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
डीएवी पब्लिक स्कूल आरबीआई एन्क्लेव,
पश्चिम विहार, नई दिल्ली-110063

60. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
महाराजा अग्रसेन अस्पताल चेरिटेबल ट्रस्ट,
(रजि.) रोड. नं. 35, पंजाबी बाग (पश्चिम),
नई दिल्ली-110060

61. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
एआईटीए ट्रस्ट आर.के. खन्ना टेनिस स्टेडियम
अफ्रीका एवेन्यू, आर.के. पुरम,
सेक्टर-2 के सामने
नई दिल्ली-110029

62. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
59/17, भूतल, मेन रोड
कालकाजी एक्सटेंशन,
नई दिल्ली-110019

63. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
एम-1,2,3, कनाट सर्कस,
कनाट प्लेस,
नई दिल्ली-110001

64. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
सी-ब्लॉक, पश्चिम मार्ग
वसंत विहार, नई दिल्ली-110057

65. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
ई-38, ग्रेटर कैलाश-I, नई दिल्ली-110048

66. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
ई-14, साकूथ एक्सटेंशन, पार्ट-II,
नई दिल्ली-110049

67. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
डी-7, पालम डाबरी रोड
महावीर एन्क्लेव, पालम,
नई दिल्ली-110045

68. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
35, नॉर्थ वेस्ट एवेन्यू,
वेस्ट पंजाबी बाग, क्लब रोड,
नई दिल्ली-110026

69. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
मुद्रा पेटिका 4 ई, झंडेवाला एक्सटेंशन,
नई दिल्ली-110057

दिल्ली क्षेत्र

70. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
एल.एस.सी. बी-ब्लॉक मयूर विहार, फेज-II,
दिल्ली-110091

71. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
एफ-21, प्रीत विहार
मेन विकास मार्ग,
दिल्ली-110092

आगरा क्षेत्र

72. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
डी-507, होटल बुडलैंड बिल्डिंग
कमला नगर, आगरा-282002

73. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
तहसील सदर पुलिस लाइन के सामने,
आगरा-282010

74. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
ज्ञानस्थली पब्लिक स्कूल
शिवाजी नगर, झांसी-282001

75. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
सेवा शाखा बेसमेंट, ई-15/8, प्रिंस टावर,
संजय प्लेस, आगरा-282002

76. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
मुद्रा पेटिका 71-बी, बैंक कालोनी,
सुभाष पार्क के सामने, एम.जी. रोड,
आगरा-282001

जयपुर क्षेत्र

77. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
स्वागत भवन के सामने
नगर सुधार न्यास परिसर,
भरतपुर-321001

78. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
यू टी आई भिवाड़ी
सेक्टर-1, भिवाड़ी (जिला: अलवर)
पिन: 301019

79. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
कोठारी भवन, सदर बाजार
डाकघर-डेगाना, जिला: नागौर
पिन: 341503

80. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
चौधरी बाजार
झालरापाटन, सिटी झालरा
81. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
नं.-1/20, गांधी पथ चित्रकूट,
जयपुर-302021
82. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
केशव विद्यापीठ समिति
ग्राम जामडोली, (जिला: जयपुर)
83. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
राजस्थान राज्य कृषि एवं मार्किटिंग बोर्ड,
पंत कृषि भवन, जयपुर-302005
84. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
शो रूम 44-47 एवं 61-62, ए-5,
सेंट्रल स्पाइन, अग्रसेन टावर,
विद्याधार नगर, जयपुर-302012
85. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
संगम टावर, ग्राउंड फ्लोर, चर्च रोड,
जयपुर-302021
86. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
डी.आर.डी.ए. कलेक्ट्रेट, जोधपुर
87. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
हैप्पी ऑवर्स स्कूल
अजीत भवन, सर्किट हाऊस के पास,
जोधपुर
88. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
श्री सूमेर सीनियर सेकेंडरी स्कूल
महामंदिर, मंडोर रोड, जोधपुर
89. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
489-बी, निखार भवन
कमला नेहरू नगर,
चौपासनी रोड, जोधपुर
90. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
प्लॉट नं. 937, 10 डी रोड
सरदारपुरा, जोधपुर
91. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
कृषि उपज मंडी समिति,
अनंतपुरा, कोटा
92. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
518 ए.एस.सी. बटालियन
टी-35, ईस्टर्न एक्लेव, कोटा मिलिट्री स्टेशन,
कोटा
93. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
इंद्रा विहार कालोनी
रीको बिल्डिंग कोटा-324005
94. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
जैन विश्व भारती इंस्टीट्यूट परिसर,
पोस्ट बॉक्स नं. 12 लाडनू (जिला: नागौर)
पिन: 341306
95. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
3-के-पी अपार्टमेंट, हिरण मगरी, सेक्टर-4,
वडयपुर-303001
96. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
सेवा शाखा नं.-23, राजा मेशन,
परनामी मंदिर के सामने
मोक्षिद मार्ग, आदर्श नगर, जयपुर
97. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
मुद्रा पेटिका, पुरानी चुंगी के पास
अजमेर रोड, जयपुर-302006
भोपाल क्षेत्र
98. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
आल सेंट्रल स्कूल
ईदगाह हिल्स
भोपाल-462002
99. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
नगर पालिका निगम
जोन-6, हर्षवर्धन काम्प्लेक्स
अर्वाति बाई चौराहा, तुलसी नगर,
भोपाल-462003
100. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
6, स्टेशन रोड,
देवास-455001
101. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
मानसिक आरोग्यशाला
(एम.पी.) जेल रोड,
ग्वालियर-474009
102. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
विशेष क्षेत्र विकास प्राधिकरण
प्लॉट नं. 12, सिटी सेंटर,
ग्वालियर-474009
करनाल क्षेत्र
103. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
एम.एम. कालेज ऑफ डेंटल साइंस एंड रिसर्च
मुलाना कॉम्प्लेक्स,
मुलाना

104. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
एन.सी. इंजीनियरिंग कालिज
इसराना-132107
105. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
सेक्टर-12, अर्बन एस्टेट,
करनाल-132001
106. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
सेठ जयप्रकाश मुकंद लाल इस्टीट्यूट ऑफ
इंजीनियरिंग एंड टेक्नोलॉजी,
चेटा बांस, रादौर
107. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
मुद्रा पेटिका एम-4, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया,
पानीपत-132103
बरेली क्षेत्र
108. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
श्रीराम मूर्ति मेडिकल स्मारक ट्रस्ट,
बरेली
109. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
स्प्रिंगडेल कालेज
पीलीभीत बाईपास, बिचपाड़ी रोड,
बरेली
रोहतक क्षेत्र
110. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
वैश्य/सीनियर सेकेंडरी स्कूल
शिक्षा मार्ग, भिवानी-127021
111. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
पुलिस स्टेशन के सामने
पटियाला रोड जाखल (जिला: फतेहाबाद),
पिन: 125133
112. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
एम.डी.एन. पब्लिक स्कूल
नजदीक बस अड्डा,
रोहतक-124001
113. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
मुद्रा पेटिका
97, भूतल, मानसरोवर पार्क के पास
सोनीपत रोड,
रोहतक-124001
गुड़गांव क्षेत्र
114. ओरियन्टल बैंक ऑफ कॉमर्स
दुकान नं. 101/102, शॉप एन पार्क मार्किट
डी. एल. एफ.-II,
गुड़गांव-12201
- केनरा बैंक**
115. केनरा बैंक
बागलूर शाखा, देवनहल्लि तालूक
बेंगलूर जिला-562149 कर्नाटक
116. केनरा बैंक
बी टी एम लेआऊट शाखा
57 एवं 58, बी टी एम I स्टेज
II मेईन रोड, 100 फीट रोड
बी जी सर्किल, बी टी एम लेआऊट,
बेंगलूर-560076 कर्नाटक
117. केनरा बैंक
बी डी ए काम्प्लेक्स शाखा
ग्राउंड फ्लोर, बी डी ए अनेक्स बिल्डिंग,
चौडय्या रोड, बेंगलूर-560020
कर्नाटक
118. केनरा बैंक
कापोरेट उपभोक्ता वित्त शाखा
4/1, वाल्टन रोड, लावेल्ले रोड,
बेंगलूर-560001, कर्नाटक
119. केनरा बैंक
देवरजीवनहल्लि शाखा
नं. 19, 15वां क्रॉस सगायपुर डेविस रोड
बेंगलूर-560005, कर्नाटक
120. केनरा बैंक
गिरिनगर शाखा नं. 405, जे पी रोड
विश्वभारती हाऊसिंग काम्प्लेक्स
गिरिनगर बेंगलूर-560085, कर्नाटक
121. केनरा बैंक
एच ए एल III स्टेज शाखा
नं. 1, अन्नपूर्णेश्वरी काम्प्लेक्स
बी ई एम एल के सामने न्यू तिप्पसंद्रा
एच ए एल III स्टेज बेंगलूर-560075
कर्नाटक
122. केनरा बैंक
हाऊसिंग फैनान्स शाखा
96, I तल, साऊथ एण्ड रोड
बेंगलूर-560004, कर्नाटक
123. केनरा बैंक
इनफांट्री रोड शाखा नं. 91, इनफांट्री रोड,
बेंगलूर-560001, कर्नाटक
124. केनरा बैंक
जे पी नगर II फेस शाखा
827, 24वां मेईन, 12वां क्रॉस
जे पी नगर II फेस,
बेंगलूर-560001, कर्नाटक

125. केनरा बैंक
जयनगर IV 'टी' ब्लॉक शाखा
364, 16वाँ मेईन रोड 4वाँ टी ब्लॉक, जयनगर
बेंगलूर-560011 कर्नाटक
126. केनरा बैंक
एच एस आर ले आऊट शाखा
145, टीचर्स कालोनी 5वाँ सेक्टर रिंग रोड कोरमंगला
बेंगलूर-560034 कर्नाटक
127. केनरा बैंक
के एस एफ सी शाखा
के एस एफ सी कॉम्प्लेक्स
नं. 1/1, तिममय्या रोड
बेंगलूर-560052 कर्नाटक
128. केनरा बैंक
मडिवाला शाखा 21/01, होसूर मेईन रोड
मडिवाला बेंगलूर-560068 कर्नाटक
129. केनरा बैंक
मल्लेश्वरम् शाखा
पी बी नं. 307, 38 & 39
Vवाँ क्रास रोड बेंगलूर-560003 कर्नाटक
130. केनरा बैंक
माईको शाखा बन्नरघट्टा रोड
आडुगोडि बेंगलूर-560030 कर्नाटक
131. केनरा बैंक
नीलसंद्रा शाखा
38/6, 38/7, 38/16, बाजार स्ट्रीट,
नीलसंद्रा बेंगलूर-560047 कर्नाटक
132. केनरा बैंक
पद्मनाभनगर शाखा
17/3(नई नं. 25) सत्यन काम्प्लेक्स
बेंद्रेनगर कर्मिल पद्मनाभनगर
बेंगलूर-560071 कर्नाटक
133. केनरा बैंक
राजाजीनगर III ब्लॉक शाखा
628, 629, III ब्लॉक राजाजीनगर
बेंगलूर-560010 कर्नाटक
134. केनरा बैंक
संपंगीरामनगर शाखा
12/2, लालबाग रोड संपंगीरामनगर
बेंगलूर-560027 कर्नाटक
135. केनरा बैंक
सारक्की ले आऊट शाखा
नं. 220, 46वाँ क्रास 8वाँ ब्लॉक, जयनगर
बेंगलूर-560011 कर्नाटक
136. केनरा बैंक
शेषाद्रीपुरम् शाखा
पी बी नं. 2047, 179, रूपा कॉम्प्लेक्स,
I मेईन शेषाद्रीपुरम्
बेंगलूर-560020 कर्नाटक
137. केनरा बैंक
बेंगलूर स्टॉक एक्सचेंज शाखा
51, II फ्लोर, स्टॉक एक्सचेंज टावर्स
इनक्रास, जे सी रोड
बेंगलूर-560027 कर्नाटक
138. केनरा बैंक
एम आई सी आर सेंटर बेंगलूर कर्नाटक
139. केनरा बैंक
हलसूर शाखा
पी बी नं. 883, 18/1 केम्ब्रिड्ज रोड, हलसूर
बेंगलूर-560008 कर्नाटक
140. केनरा बैंक
विद्यारण्यपुरा शाखा
194, Iवाँ ब्लॉक, Iवाँ क्रास
एन टी आई ले आऊट विद्यारण्यपुरा
बेंगलूर-560040 कर्नाटक
141. केनरा बैंक
विवेकनगर शाखा
99, वन्नरपेट ले आऊट
Iवाँ मेईन रोड, विवेकनगर
बेंगलूर-560047 कर्नाटक
142. केनरा बैंक
चंदापुर सर्किल शाखा
140, होसूर रोड चंदापुर सर्किल
अत्तिबेले मार्ग बेंगलूर-562145 कर्नाटक
143. केनरा बैंक
एस एस आई मादेवपुरा शाखा
बेंगलूर कर्नाटक
144. केनरा बैंक
बरगूर शाखा
मेईन रोड, बरगूर शाखा सिरा तालूक
तुमकूर जिला-572113 कर्नाटक
145. केनरा बैंक
होन्नगानहल्लि शाखा
कनकपुरा तालूक
बेंगलूर जिला-562126 कर्नाटक
146. केनरा बैंक
कुलुवनहल्लि शाखा नेलमंगला तालूक
बेंगलूर जिला-562111 कर्नाटक

147. केनरा बैंक
शिवगंगा शाखा
नेलमंगला तालूक
बेंगलूर जिला-562111 कर्नाटक
148. केनरा बैंक
त्यामगोड्लु शाखा
नं. 1078, पी बी नं. 1,
हुमकूर-बेंगलूर मेईन रोड त्यामगोड्लु
बेंगलूर जिला-562132 कर्नाटक
149. केनरा बैंक
लीड बैंक ऑफीस, दावणगेरे
धक्कमल्लदेवी रोड
पी जे एक्स्टेन्शन रोड
दावणगेरे-577002 कर्नाटक
150. केनरा बैंक
रामगिरी शाखा
गुरुसदन, रेलवे स्टेशन के पास
रामगिरी, होललकरे तालूक
चित्रदुर्गा जिला-577539 कर्नाटक
151. केनरा बैंक
क्यालनूर शाखा
श्रीनिवास निलया मारुती रोड, क्यालनूर
कोलार जिला-563133 कर्नाटक
152. केनरा बैंक
बसरालु शाखा
मेईन रोड बसरालु
मण्ड्या जिला-571416 कर्नाटक
153. केनरा बैंक
हिट्टनहल्लि शाखा
मलवल्लि तालूक मण्ड्या जिला-571424 कर्नाटक
154. केनरा बैंक
जयलक्ष्मीपुरम् शाखा
नं. 8, 'गंगा', टेम्पल रोड
जयलक्ष्मीपुरम् मैसूर-570012 कर्नाटक
155. केनरा बैंक
सरस्वतीपुरम् शाखा
120, "हंसिनी", पी बी नं. 6,
10वां मेईन, V1 क्रास सरस्वतीपुरम् शाखा
मैसूर-570009 कर्नाटक
156. केनरा बैंक
मैसूर इंडस्ट्रियल सबर्ब शाखा
ट्रान्स हाऊस, पी बी नं. 304
ममतोडी रोड इंडस्ट्रियल सबर्ब
मैसूर-570008 कर्नाटक
157. केनरा बैंक
नागमंगला शाखा
बेंगलूर-मैसूर रोड नागमंगला
मण्ड्या जिला-571432 कर्नाटक
158. केनरा बैंक
सिंधघट्टा शाखा
मण्ड्या जिला-571465 कर्नाटक
159. केनरा बैंक
टी नरसीपुरा शाखा
पोस्ट ऑफीस रोड, नं. 872 टी नरसीपुरा
मैसूर जिला-571124 कर्नाटक
160. केनरा बैंक
एल वी डी कॉलेज रायचूर शाखा
एल वी डी कॉलेज रोड
रायचूर-584103 कर्नाटक
161. केनरा बैंक
मुद्रा कोष, भूतल
कृषिक समाज बिल्डिंग
हडसन सर्किल, नृपतुंगा रोड
बेंगलूर-560002
162. केनरा बैंक
मुद्रा कोष, चित्रदुर्गा
बी डी रोड
चित्रदुर्गा-577501 कर्नाटक
163. केनरा बैंक
मुद्रा कोष, गुलबर्गा
बिल्डिंग नं. 132, सुपर मार्केट
टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज के सामने
गुलबर्गा-585101 कर्नाटक
164. केनरा बैंक
मुद्रा कोष, रायचूर
नं. 10-2-29,
सिटी टाकीस रोड, माबलेश्वर चौक
रायचूर-584102 कर्नाटक
165. केनरा बैंक
अरकरे बन्नेघट्टा रोड शाखा
नं. 225-226 ए जी एन कल्याण मंपट के पास
बन्नेरघट्टा रोड,
बेंगलूर-560076, कर्नाटक
166. केनरा बैंक
कुरुबरहल्लि शाखा
नं. 91/1, पाईपलाईन रोड
जे सी नगर, कुरुबरहल्लि
बेंगलूर-560086, कर्नाटक

167. केनरा बैंक
लेखा अनुभाग, बेंगलूर
"कृषि भवन", पोलीस कार्गन के पास
नृपतुंग रोड, पी बी नं. 5471,
बेंगलूर-560002 कर्नाटक
168. केनरा बैंक
अग्रणी बैंक कार्यालय
बेंगलूर अरबन 29, एम एन कै राव पार्क रोड
बसवनगुडी, बेंगलूर-560004 कर्नाटक
169. केनरा बैंक
अग्रणी बैंक कार्यालय
II वां क्रॉस, न्यू एक्सटेंशन
पी बी नं. 2 कोलार-563101 कर्नाटक
170. केनरा बैंक
मुद्रा कोष, मैसूर केनरा बैंक भवन
26/ए, गेस्ट हाऊस रोड,
नजरबाद मैसूर-570010 कर्नाटक
171. केनरा बैंक
कृषि वित्त शाखा
नं. 13/10, 3वां क्रॉस
सी एस आई, सी एम पी डी
I तल, ब्लॉक, यूनिट बिल्डिंग
बेंगलूर-560002
172. केनरा बैंक
बसवनगुडी शाखा
पोस्ट बॉक्स नं. 493,
180/1, गांधी बाजार
बसवनगुडी, बेंगलूर-560004 कर्नाटक
173. केनरा बैंक
बेनसन टाऊन शाखा
पी बी सं. 4608, 18/ए,
मिल्लर्स रोड, बेनसन टाऊन
बेंगलूर-560046 कर्नाटक
174. केनरा बैंक
डी कोस्टा स्क्वेयर शाखा
नं. 98/1-2, वीलर रोड एक्सटेंशन
कूक टाऊन बेंगलूर-560005 कर्नाटक
175. केनरा बैंक
फ्रेजर टाऊन शाखा
86/3, कोल्स रोड
बेंगलूर-560005 कर्नाटक
176. केनरा बैंक
गोकुला शाखा
438/सी, एच एम टी मेईन रोड
बेंगलूर-560054 कर्नाटक
177. केनरा बैंक
होम्बेगौडनगर शाखा
नं. 211/62, 11वां क्रॉस
विलसन गार्डन, होम्बेगौडनगर
बेंगलूर-560027 कर्नाटक
178. केनरा बैंक
औद्योगिक वित्त शाखा
वेकटाद्री कॉम्प्लेक्स नं. 83, रिचमंड रोड
बेंगलूर-560025 कर्नाटक
179. केनरा बैंक
इस्त्रो ले आऊट शाखा
218, 1वां मेईन रोड
2वां क्रॉस, इस्त्रो ले आऊट
बेंगलूर-560078 कर्नाटक
180. केनरा बैंक
जयनगर शापिंग कॉम्प्लेक्स शाखा
पी बी नं. 1611,
जयनगर शापिंग कॉम्प्लेक्स
बेंगलूर-560011 कर्नाटक
181. केनरा बैंक
कोदण्डरामपुरम् शाखा
पी बी नं. 391, शणमुख,
नं. 78, I टेम्पल रोड,
11 वां क्रॉस, मल्लेश्वरम्,
बेंगलूर-560003 कर्नाटक
182. केनरा बैंक
कोरमंगला ले आऊट शाखा
पी बी नं. 3421, नं. 348
100 फीट रोड, 4वां ब्लॉक
कोरमंगला ले आऊट
बेंगलूर-560034 कर्नाटक
183. केनरा बैंक
लोटेगोल्लहल्लि शाखा
9, चामुंडी कॉम्प्लेक्स
रिंग रोड, मारुती नगर
आर एम वी II स्टेज
लोटेगोल्लहल्लि
बेंगलूर-560094 कर्नाटक
184. केनरा बैंक
महिला बैंकिंग शाखा
जयनगर III ब्लॉक बेंगलूर-560011 कर्नाटक
185. केनरा बैंक
मारत हल्लि शाखा
453/418, चन्नकेशव निवास
मारतहल्लि रोड मारत हल्लि
बेंगलूर-560037 कर्नाटक

186. केनरा बैंक
आस्ति वसुली प्रबंधन शाखा
iii तल, स्पेनसर्स टावर्स
नं. 86, एम जी रोड
बेंगलूर-560 001 कर्नाटक
187. केनरा बैंक
एन आर आई शाखा
शंकर नारायण बिल्डिंग
ग्राउंड फ्लोर, 25, एम जी रोड,
बेंगलूर-560 001 कर्नाटक
188. केनरा बैंक
पीण्या एस एस आई शाखा
नं. 4, के एस एस आई डी सी
मल्टिस्टोरीड इंडस्ट्रियल कॉम्प्लेक्स
6वां मेईन, II स्टेज, पीण्या
बेंगलूर-560 058 कर्नाटक
189. केनरा बैंक
सहकारनगर शाखा
साइट नं. 529, मेईन रोड
सहकारनगर बेल्लारी रोड
बेंगलूर-560 092 कर्नाटक
190. केनरा बैंक
संजयनगर शाखा बेंगलूर कर्नाटक
191. केनरा बैंक
शांतिनगर शाखा
18, केंगल हनुमंतय्या रोड शांतिनगर
बेंगलूर-560 027 कर्नाटक
192. केनरा बैंक
श्री सत्य साई शाखा
बृंदावन वाइटफील्ड कडुगोडि
बेंगलूर-560 067 कर्नाटक
193. केनरा बैंक
सुब्रमण्यनगर शाखा
4216, 1वां मेईन रोड सुब्रमण्यनगर
बेंगलूर-560 021 कर्नाटक
194. केनरा बैंक
तुमकूर रोड शाखा
बेंगलूर तुमकूर रोड
14, इंडस्ट्रियल सबर्ब यशवंतपुर
बेंगलूर-560 022 कर्नाटक
195. केनरा बैंक
उत्तरहल्लि शाखा
नं. 1, उत्तरहल्लि सर्कि.
बेंगलूर-560 061 कर्नाटक
196. केनरा बैंक
विश्वेश्वरपुरम् शाखा
पी बी नं. 490, 550,
विश्वेश्वर डयागनल रोड विश्वेश्वरपुरम्
बेंगलूर-560 004 कर्नाटक
197. केनरा बैंक
बेगूर शाखा मेरी निलया जोसेफ गार्डन, बेगूर
बेंगलूर-560 068 कर्नाटक
198. केनरा बैंक
चिक्कबिदिरकल्लु शाखा
चिक्कबिदिरकल्लु
बेंगलूर-560 073 कर्नाटक
199. केनरा बैंक
दोड्डकन्नहल्लि शाखा
रेईनबो ड्राईव लेआउट
दोड्डकन्नहल्लि सर्जापुर रोड
बेंगलूर कर्नाटक
200. केनरा बैंक
हाराहेल्लि शाखा
केंपय्या बिल्डिंग बस स्टैंड, हाराहेल्लि
बेंगलूर जिला-562 112 कर्नाटक
201. केनरा बैंक
हुलियार शाखा
गर्लस मिडल स्कूल के सामने हुलियार
तुमकूर जिला-572 218 कर्नाटक
202. केनरा बैंक
मडलूर शाखा सिरा तालूक
तुमकूर जिला-572 137 कर्नाटक
203. केनरा बैंक
चामराजनगर शाखा
पोस्ट बॉक्स नं. 2, चामराजनगर
मैसूर जिला-572 313 कर्नाटक
204. केनरा बैंक
वीरेगोडनदोड्डी शाखा
मागडी मेईन रोड वीरेगोडनदोड्डी
मागडी तालूक बेंगलूर जिला-561 201 कर्नाटक
205. केनरा बैंक
जानकल शाखा
नं. 406, मेईन रोड जानकल, होसदुर्गा तालूक
चित्रदुर्गा जिला-577 527 कर्नाटक
206. केनरा बैंक
बीचिगानहल्लि शाखा
श्रीकंटय्या बिल्डिंग बीचिगानहल्लि, गुडिबंडा तालूक
कोलार जिला-561 209 कर्नाटक

207. केनरा बैंक
अरकोरे शाखा
डॉ. गोविंद गौडा प्रिमेसिस
पी बी नं. 1, मेईन रोड अरकोरे
मैसूर जिला-571 415 कर्नाटक
208. केनरा बैंक
बेट्टदपुरा शाखा पिरियापट्टण रोड
मैसूर जिला-571 102 कर्नाटक
209. केनरा बैंक
मण्डया शाखा
नं. 1572, पी बी नं. 2,
मण्डया-571 401 कर्नाटक
210. केनरा बैंक
नजरबाद शाखा
ग्रौंड फ्लोर 26/ए, सी बी भवन
गैस्ट हाऊस रोड नजरबाद,
मैसूर-570 010 कर्नाटक
211. केनरा बैंक
सिद्धार्थनगर शाखा नं. 6, सिद्धार्थनगर
मैसूर-570 010 कर्नाटक
212. केनरा बैंक
विवेकानंदनगर शाखा
मैसूर, कर्नाटक
213. केनरा बैंक
नंजनगुडु शाखा
1692, प्रिया कांप्लेक्स
पी बी नं. 4, नंजनगुडु
मैसूर जिला-571 301 कर्नाटक
214. केनरा बैंक
श्रीरंगपट्टण शाखा
1वां फ्लोर, 692, मेईन रोड श्रीरंगपट्टण
मण्डया जिला-571 438 कर्नाटक
215. केनरा बैंक
मलखेड आदित्यनगर शाखा
मलखेड सेदम कर्नाटक
216. केनरा बैंक
महालिंगपुरा शाखा
बसवेश्वर सर्किल के पास मेईन रोड,
महालिंगपुर मुधोल तालूक
बागलकोट जिला-587 312 कर्नाटक
217. केनरा बैंक
प्र का मुद्रा कोष, भूतल, 112
जे.सी. रोड बेंगलूर-560 002
कर्नाटक
218. केनरा बैंक
मुद्रा कोष, दावणगेरे नं. 118/2, के आर रोड
बी टी आइल मिल काम्पौड
दावणगेरे-577 001 कर्नाटक
219. केनरा बैंक
मुद्रा कोष, बेल्लारी
डिस्ट्रिक्ट चेम्बर ऑफ कामर्स बिल्डिंग
के सी रोड बेल्लारी-583 101 कर्नाटक
220. केनरा बैंक
मुद्रा कोष, तुमकूर हजरत मदर शाह मकान
अशोका रोड तुमकूर-572 102 कर्नाटक
221. केनरा बैंक
जी के बी के शाखा
यूनिवर्सिटी ऑफ अग्रिकल्चर साईन्स
बेल्लारी रोड बेंगलूर-560 065 कर्नाटक
222. केनरा बैंक
नेरलूर शाखा जगलूर पोस्ट, चन्नपट्टण तालूक,
बेंगलूर जिला-562 138 कर्नाटक
223. केनरा बैंक
मुद्रा कोष, नं. 39, 8वां मेईन
5वां क्रास, राजमहल विलास विस्तरण
सदाशिवनगर, बेंगलूर-560 080 कर्नाटक
224. केनरा बैंक
अग्रणी बैंक कार्यालय
बेंगलूर ग्रामीण चित्तापूर मठ कांप्लेक्स
8वां मेईन, 15वां क्रास, मल्लेश्वरम्
बेंगलूर-560 005 कर्नाटक
225. केनरा बैंक
मुद्रा कोष चिंतामणि
"स्वामी कृपा" पॉलिटेक्निक रोड
चिंतामणि-563 125 कर्नाटक
226. केनरा बैंक
अग्रणी बैंक कार्यालय
2584/470, बी आर रोड
पी बी नं. 20 चित्रदुर्गा-577 501 कर्नाटक
227. केनरा बैंक
केंगरी सेटलाइट टाऊन
सं. 6, 80 फीट रास्ता आउटर रिंग रास्ता
केंगरी सेटलाइट टाऊन
बेंगलूर-560 060 कर्नाटक
228. केनरा बैंक
न्यू बी ई एल रोड
एम एस रामय्या मेडिकल टीचिंग अस्पताल
न्यू बी ई एल रोड बेंगलूर-560 054 कर्नाटक

229. केनरा बैंक
राजराजेश्वरी नगर सं. 118, 12वीं क्रॉस
आइडियल होम्स बिल्डिंग
कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटी राजराजेश्वरी सर्किल
राजराजेश्वरी नगर
बेंगलूर-560 098 कर्नाटक
230. केनरा बैंक
बागलगुटे सं. 5, हेसरघट्टा रोड
बागलगुटे बेंगलूर-560073 कर्नाटक
231. केनरा बैंक
— इम्पीरियल टॉवर, एम.एस. प्लॉट प्लैट,
जीएफ/एच एल ई-1, व बी एस-1,
कम्युनिटी सेंटर नारायणा विहार शाखा
नई दिल्ली-110 028
232. केनरा बैंक
द्वारका शाखा
पॉकेट-6, सेक्टर-12,
नई दिल्ली-110 075
233. केनरा बैंक
राजेंद्र नगर शाखा,
डी ए वी पब्लिक स्कूल
साहिबाबाद, गाजियाबाद-201 005
उत्तर प्रदेश
234. केनरा बैंक
एस सी ओ-11, सेक्टर-16 शाखा
फरीदाबाद-121 002 हरियाणा
235. केनरा बैंक
एससीओ, 34 व 35, सेक्टर-10ए शाखा
गुडगांव-122002 हरियाणा
236. केनरा बैंक
हंसराज कॉलेज शाखा
(यूनिवर्सिटी ऑफ दिल्ली)
महत्मा हंसराज कॉलेज मार्ग,
दिल्ली-110 007
237. केनरा बैंक
सुप्रीम प्लाजा, प्रथम तल, प्लॉट नं. 15
सेक्टर-6, द्वारका शाखा, नई दिल्ली-110 075
238. केनरा बैंक
पी ए सी 47 बटालियन, गोविन्दपुरम शाखा,
गाजियाबाद-201 001 उत्तर प्रदेश
239. केनरा बैंक
एफ सी ओ 2 व 3,
हुडा शॉपिंग कॉम्प्लेक्स सेक्टर-9 शाखा,
फरीदाबाद-121 001 हरियाणा

240. केनरा बैंक
डीएलएफ एन्क्लेव शाखा
एसजी-27/28, डीएलएफ गलेरिया
फेस-IV, डीएलएफ सिटी, गुडगांव-122 002 हरियाणा

सिंडिकेट बैंक

241. सिंडिकेट बैंक
टी.टी. नगर भोपाल शाखा, नं. 75, मालवीय नगर,
प्लॉट नं. 71, ग्राउण्ड फ्लोर, रोशनपुरा स्क्वायर,
टी.टी. नगर भोपाल, राज्य : मध्य प्रदेश
पिन : 462 003
242. सिंडिकेट बैंक
नरसिंहपुर शाखा, मार्फत नवीन रोडवेज बाहरी रोड स्ट्रीट,
नरसिंहपुर जिला : नरसिंहपुर राज्य : मध्य प्रदेश,
पिन : 487 001
243. सिंडिकेट बैंक
कटनी शाखा, डॉ. निगम बिल्डिंग, स्टेशन रोड, कटनी,
राज्य : मध्य प्रदेश, पिन: 483 501
244. सिंडिकेट बैंक
इटारसी शाखा, बी.एस.एन.एल ऑफिस के पास,
दयाल कॉम्प्लेक्स, गांधी नगर,
इटारसी, जिला : होशंगाबाद,
राज्य : मध्य प्रदेश, पिन-461 111
245. सिंडिकेट बैंक
अम्बाला शहर एस ए जैन मॉडल स्कूल शाखा,
एस. ए. जैन सीनियर मॉडल स्कूल, सर्कुलर रोड,
अम्बाला शहर, जिला अम्बाला, राज्य : हरियाणा,
पिन: 134 003
246. सिंडिकेट बैंक
अमृतसर मजीठा रोड शाखा, 182/1, मेन मजीठा रोड,
गंडा सिंह वाला I, अमृतसर, जिला : अमृतसर,
राज्य : पंजाब, पिन-143 004
247. सिंडिकेट बैंक
अमृतसर रंजीत एवेन्यु शाखा, एस.सी.ओ.-40,
जिला शॉपिंग सेन्टर, रंजीत एवेन्यू, अमृतसर,
जिला : अमृतसर, राज्य : पंजाब, पिन: 143 001
248. सिंडिकेट बैंक
चण्डीगढ़ सेक्टर 47 शाखा, माऊंट कार्मल स्कूल,
सेक्टर-47, चण्डीगढ़, जिला: चण्डीगढ़,
राज्य : चंडीगढ़ (संघ शासित प्रदेश), पिन: 160 047
249. सिंडिकेट बैंक
चण्डीगढ़ सेक्टर-36.ए शाखा,
पंजाब राज्य तकनीकी शिक्षा बोर्ड, सेक्टर-36 ए,
चण्डीगढ़, जिला : चण्डीगढ़, राज्य चंडीगढ़,
(संघ शासित प्रदेश), पिन : 160 036

250. सिंडिकेट बैंक
गुरदासपुर शाखा, कर्मशियल प्लॉट सं. 1, स्कीम सं. 1,
इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट कालोनी, जी. टी. रोड, गुरदासपुर,
जिला: गुरदासपुर, राज्य : पंजाब,
पिन: 143 501
251. सिंडिकेट बैंक
हिसार आजाद नगर शाखा, मिलेनियम पब्लिक स्कूल,
राजगढ़ रोड, आजाद नगर, हिसार, जिला : हिसार,
राज्य : हरियाणा, पिन: 125 001
252. सिंडिकेट बैंक
यमुना नगर जगाधरी शाखा, भगवान परशुराम मंदिर,
अंबाला रोड, जगाधरी, जिला यमुनानगर,
राज्य : हरियाणा, पिन: 135 003
253. सिंडिकेट बैंक
जालन्धर आर्मी पब्लिक स्कूल शाखा,
सशस्त्रबल परिसर, जालन्धर कैट, जिला : जालन्धर,
राज्य: पंजाब, पिन: 144 005
254. सिंडिकेट बैंक
जीन्द शाखा, दुकान सं. 1, बाल भवन के नजदीक,
रानी का तालाब, गोहाना रोड, जिला : जीन्द,
राज्य : हरियाणा, पिन: 126 102
255. सिंडिकेट बैंक
खन्ना शाखा, जी.टी. रोड मुख्य मार्केट, के.के. टॉवर्स,
खन्ना, जिला लुधियाना, राज्य : पंजाब,
पिन: 141 401
256. सिंडिकेट बैंक
लुधियाना मिल्लरगंज शाखा, बी-6--718 गिल रोड,
मिल्लरगंज, लुधियाना, जिला : लुधियाना, राज्य : पंजाब,
पिन: 141 003
257. सिंडिकेट बैंक
नवांशहर शाखा, बी-1/171, बंगा रोड, नवांशहर,
जिला: नवांशहर, राज्य : पंजाब,
पिन: 144 514
258. सिंडिकेट बैंक
रूप नगर शाखा, संख्या-3039/2, बेला चौक, रूपनगर,
जिला: रूपनगर, राज्य : पंजाब,
पिन: 140 001
259. सिंडिकेट बैंक
करनाल सद्भावना चौक शाखा,
आर.एस. पब्लिक सीनियर सेकेंडरी स्कूल,
मीरा सद्भावना चौक, करनाल,
जिला : करनाल, राज्य : हरियाणा,
पिन: 132 001
260. सिंडिकेट बैंक
करनाल रेलवे रोड शाखा, एस.डी. मॉडल स्कूल,
रेलवे रोड, करनाल, जिला : करनाल, राज्य : हरियाणा,
पिन: 132 001
261. सिंडिकेट बैंक
कुरुक्षेत्र ग्रीन फील्ड स्कूल शाखा,
ग्रीन फील्ड पब्लिक स्कूल, पिपली रोड, कुरुक्षेत्र,
जिला : कुरुक्षेत्र, राज्य : हरियाणा,
पिन : 136 118
262. सिंडिकेट बैंक
कुरुक्षेत्र सुन्दरपुर शाखा,
एस.डी. गर्ल्स सीनियर सेकेंडरी स्कूल, बाईपास रोड,
सुन्दरपुर, कुरुक्षेत्र, जिला : कुरुक्षेत्र राज्य : हरियाणा,
पिन: 136 118
263. सिंडिकेट बैंक
पालमपुर शाखा, संख्या -715, जमवाल भवन,
प्रधान डाकघर के सामने, पालमपुर, जिला : कांगड़ा,
राज्य : हिमाचल प्रदेश,
पिन : 176 1061
264. सिंडिकेट बैंक
पंचकुला स्वस्तिक विहार शाखा,
एससीओ एफ-123, मानवी देसी कॉम्प्लेक्स,
सेक्टर-5, स्वस्तिक विहार, पंचकुला,
जिला: पंचकुला, राज्य : हरियाणा,
पिन: 134 114
265. सिंडिकेट बैंक
सोलन शाखा, 61/9, भारद्वाज परिसर, राजगढ़ रोड,
सोलन, जिला : सोलन, राज्य हिमाचल प्रदेश,
पिन : 173 212
266. सिंडिकेट बैंक
अपरा शाखा, कलसी भवन, बंगा रोड, अपरा,
फिल्लौर तालुक, जिला : जालन्धर, राज्य : पंजाब,
पिन: 144 416
267. सिंडिकेट बैंक
दानापुर नियामत शाखा, राजपति कॉम्प्लेक्स,
पहली मंजिल, नगर पालिका कार्यालय के सामने,
डाकघर-दीघा, दानापुर, जिला : पटना, राज्य : बिहार,
पिन : 800 012
268. सिंडिकेट बैंक
पटना किदवईपुरी शाखा,
14, अन्निकेत आई.ए.एस. कालोनी,
एस.के. नगर, किदवईपुरी, पटना,
जिला : पटना, राज्य : बिहार
पिन: 800 001

269. सिंडिकेट बैंक
दानापुर छावनी शाखा, कैंटोनमेंट बोर्ड, छावनी सदन,
सदर बाजार, दानापुर, जिला : पटना, राज्य : बिहार,
पिन: 801 503
270. सिंडिकेट बैंक
पटना बेली रोड शाखा, ज्ञान निकेतन बिल्डिंग,
रंजन पथ, बेली रोड के पश्चिम, पटना,
जिला : पटना, राज्य : बिहार,
पिन: 801 503
271. सिंडिकेट बैंक
पटना सैदपुर शाखा, बिहार राज्य जल परिषद् बिल्डिंग,
सैदपुर रोड, पटना, जिला : पटना, राज्य : बिहार
272. सिंडिकेट बैंक
धनबाद बरटंड शाखा, एनआइआईटी कैम्पस,
सूरल कॉम्प्लेक्स, बरटंड हाउसिंग कालोनी, धनबाद,
जिला : धनबाद, राज्य : झारखंड,
पिन: 826 001
273. सिंडिकेट बैंक
भागलपुर शाखा, पटल बाबू निवास, पटल बाबू रोड,
भागलपुर, जिला : भागलपुर, राज्य : बिहार,
पिन : 812 : 001
274. सिंडिकेट बैंक
चास शाखा, गोल्डेन पैलेस, बाइपास रोड, चास,
जिला : बोकारो, राज्य : झारखंड,
पिन: 827 013
275. सिंडिकेट बैंक
दरभंगा ज्ञानभारती पब्लिक स्कूल शाखा,
लक्ष्मी सागर, दरभंगा, जिला : दरभंगा, राज्य बिहार,
पिन: 846 004
276. सिंडिकेट बैंक
बोकारो स्टील सिटी शाखा,
सी-1 सिटी सेन्टर, सेक्टर-4,
बोकारो स्टील सिटी, जिला: बोकारो, राज्य : झारखंड,
पिन: 827 004
277. सिंडिकेट बैंक
हजारीबाग शाखा, गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह रोड, हजारीबाग,
जिला : हजारीबाग, राज्य : झारखंड,
पिन: 823 301
278. सिंडिकेट बैंक
राँची लेडी के सी रॉय मेमोरियल स्कूल शाखा,
सूर्य क्लिनिक बिल्डिंग्स कुम्हार टोली रोड, नं. 2,
कांता टोली, राँची, जिला : राँची, राज्य : झारखंड
पिन: 834 001
279. सिंडिकेट बैंक
रामगढ़ शाखा, डी.एस. कॉम्प्लेक्स, मेन रोड,
रामगढ़ कैंटोनमेंट, जिला : हजारीबाग, राज्य : झारखंड,
पिन: 829 122
280. सिंडिकेट बैंक
मुंगेर शाखा, दीपक स्मृति भवन, गुलजार पोखर, मुंगेर,
जिला : मुंगेर, राज्य : बिहार,
पिन : 811.201
281. सिंडिकेट बैंक
मुजफ्फरपुर शाखा, 23, छोटी कल्याणी रोड,
कल्याणी पोस्ट ऑफिस के सामने, मुजफ्फरपुर,
जिला : मुजफ्फरपुर, राज्य : बिहार,
पिन : 842 001
282. सिंडिकेट बैंक
पाकुड़ शाखा, आनंद रेस्टोरेंट, पहली मंजिल,
टाउन हॉल के सामने, हरिदंगा बाजार मेन रोड पाकुड़,
जिला : पाकुड़, राज्य : झारखंड,
पिन : 816 107
283. सिंडिकेट बैंक
मुजफ्फरपुर तिरहुत केनाल डिविजन शाखा,
रामदयालु नगर, मुजफ्फरपुर, जिला : मुजफ्फरपुर,
राज्य : बिहार, पिन : 842 002
284. सिंडिकेट बैंक
सीवान शाखा, मोती मार्केट, बबुनिया मोड़,
जिला : सीवान, राज्य : बिहार,
पिन: 841 226
285. सिंडिकेट बैंक
रांची कचहरी रोड शाखा,
रांची रीजनल डेवलपमेंट अथॉरिटी बिल्डिंग,
कचहरी रोड, रांची, जिला : रांची, राज्य : झारखंड,
पिन : 834 001
286. सिंडिकेट बैंक
पूसा आइ ए आर आइ कैम्पस शाखा,
इण्डियन एग्रीकल्चर रिसर्च इन्स्टीट्यूट ब्लॉक,
एण्ड पी एस पूसा, जिला : समस्तीपुर, राज्य : बिहार,
पिन : 848 125
287. सिंडिकेट बैंक
सीतामढ़ी शाखा, कृष्ण मार्केट, डुमरा रोड, सीतामढ़ी,
जिला : सीतामढ़ी, राज्य : बिहार,
पिन: 843 302
288. सिंडिकेट बैंक
छपरा शाखा, बी.पी. मेडिसिन काम्प्लेक्स, श्रीनंदन रोड,
म्युनिसिपल चौक, छपरा, जिला : सारन, राज्य : बिहार,
पिन : 841 301

289. सिडिकेट बैंक
जमशेदपुर राजेन्द्र विद्यालय शाखा, स्वर्ण रेखा, लिंक रोड,
साक्षी, जमशेदपुर, जिला : पूर्वी सिंहभूम, राज्य : झारखंड,
पिन : 831 001
290. सिडिकेट बैंक
देवघर शाखा, 94, असम एक्सस रोड, होटल प्रभा
कॉम्प्लेक्स, देवघर, जिला : देवघर, राज्य : झारखंड,
पिन: 814 112
291. सिडिकेट बैंक
नारायणपुर शाखा, डाकघर दावत द्वार विक्रमगंज,
जिला : रोहतास, राज्य : बिहार,
पिन : 802 226
292. सिडिकेट बैंक
हाजीपुर शाखा, राजपतिकुंवर शॉपिंग सेन्टर,
डाक बंगलो रोड, हाजीपुर,
जिला : वैशाली, राज्य : बिहार,
पिन : 844 101.
293. सिडिकेट बैंक
घोड़परास शाखा, डाकघर-सर्वण, घोड़परास,
जिला : देवघर : राज्य : झारखंड,
पिन: 814 150
294. सिडिकेट बैंक
सबैजोर शाखा, ग्राम एवं डाकघर-सबैजोर द्वारा सरथ,
जिला : देवघर, राज्य : झारखंड,
पिन: 814 149
295. सिडिकेट बैंक
लघु सचिवालय शाखा, सेक्टर 12, फरीदाबाद,
जिला : फरीदाबाद, राज्य हरियाणा,
पिन : 121 007
296. सिडिकेट बैंक
सेक्टर 21 सी शाखा, एससीओ 138, सेक्टर 21 सी,
फरीदाबाद, जिला : फरीदाबाद, राज्य : हरियाणा,
पिन : 121 001
297. सिडिकेट बैंक
म्युनिसिपल कॉर्पोरेशन शाखा, म्युनिसिपल कॉर्पोरेशन,
फरीदाबाद कॉम्प्लेक्स, एम सी एफ रोड, बी.के. चौक,
फरीदाबाद, जिला : फरीदाबाद, राज्य : हरियाणा,
पिन : 121 001
298. सिडिकेट बैंक
लघु व मध्यम उद्यम शाखा, 1, एफ-20,
न्यू इंडस्ट्रियल टाउन, फरीदाबाद,
जिला : फरीदाबाद, राज्य : हरियाणा,
पिन: 121 005
299. सिडिकेट बैंक
डी एल एफ गुडगाँव शाखा, सं. ए-209, सुपर मार्केट नं. 1
डी एल एफ फेज 4, जिला : गुडगाँव, राज्य : हरियाणा,
पिन : 122 009
300. सिडिकेट बैंक
आईटीएम गुडगाँव शाखा, इन्स्टीट्यूट ऑफ टेक्नॉलाजी,
एण्ड मैनेजमेंट कैम्पस, पालम विहार, सेक्टर-23ए,
गुडगाँव, जिला : गुडगाँव, राज्य : हरियाणा,
पिन: 122 017
301. सिडिकेट बैंक
ए.एफ.एस. गुडगाँव शाखा, टी-51, सोहना रोड,
कैम्पस एअर फोर्स स्टेशन, कैपस, गुडगाँव,
जिला : गुडगाँव, राज्य हरियाणा,
पिन: 122 001
302. सिडिकेट बैंक
लघु व मध्यम उद्यम शाखा, मेहरौली रोड, सेक्टर 17,
सुखराली, गुडगाँव, जिला : गुडगाँव, राज्य : हरियाणा,
पिन : 122 001
303. सिडिकेट बैंक
एम एन हॉस्पिटल एंड रिसर्च सेन्टर शाखा,
डॉ. करणी सिंह स्टेडियम के पास, बीकानेर,
जिला : बीकानेर, राज्य : राजस्थान,
पिन: 334 001
304. सिडिकेट बैंक
अलवर दयानन्द मार्ग बी.एच.एस. समिति, शाखा,
बाल हित शिक्षा समिति बिल्डिंग, स्वामी दयानंद मार्ग,
अलवर, जिला : अलवर, राज्य : राजस्थान,
पिन: 301 001
305. सिडिकेट बैंक
मालवीय नगर शाखा, जी. 139, मालवीय नगर,
इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, जिला : जयपुर, राज्य : राजस्थान,
पिन: 302 017
306. सिडिकेट बैंक
जोधपुर पाल रोड एलआइसी सीए शाखा, पाल रोड,
शास्त्रीनगर, जोधपुर, जिला : जोधपुर, राज्य : राजस्थान,
पिन: 342 001
307. सिडिकेट बैंक
श्री गंगानगर शाखा, 7-बी, रवीन्द्रपथ, श्री गंगानगर,
जिला : गंगानगर, राज्य : राजस्थान,
पिन : 335 001
308. सिडिकेट बैंक
अग्रणी जिला कार्यालय, नूह (मेवात),
जनरल हॉस्पिटल रोड, नूह, जिला : मेवात,
राज्य : हरियाणा,
पिन: 121 007

309. सिंडिकेट बैंक
नल्लसोपारा शाखा, शाप नं. 1 से 6 तक,
भारत वैभव बिल्डिंग, अछोले रोड, नल्लसोपारा (पूर्व),
वसई तालुक, जिला : थाणे, राज्य : महाराष्ट्र,
पिन: 401 209
310. सिंडिकेट बैंक
ग्रांड रोड शाखा, मार्केट स्क्वॉयर पुरी,
जिला : पुरी, राज्य : उड़ीसा,
पिन : 752 001
- युनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया**
311. युनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया
बनगांवा शाखा, पो. बनगांवा, भाया नरहैया,
जिला : मधुबनी, (बिहार) 847226
312. युनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया
बार कॉमिसल शाखा, हाईकोर्ट कॉम्पाउण्ड,
पटना-800001 (बिहार)
313. युनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया
बसंतपुर पट्टी, प्रखंड-सरैया, पो. बसंतपुर पट्टी,
भाया : बखरा, जिला : मुजफ्फरपुर, (बिहार)
314. युनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया
बेलसन्डीतारा शाखा, भाया सिंधिया घाट,
जिला : समस्तीपुर-848212 (बिहार)
315. युनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया
चचराहा शाखा, पो. चचराहा भाया जयनगर,
प्रखंड : बांसोपट्टी, जिला मधुबनी-847226 (बिहार)
316. युनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया
धरहरा शाखा, जी.एल.एम. कॉलेज रोड, पो. बनमंछी,
जिला : पूर्णिया-845202, (बिहार)
317. युनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया
मांछीपुर शाखा, ग्राम + पोस्ट मांछीपुर भाया सबौर,
जिला भागलपुर-813210 (बिहार)
318. युनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया
महदीपुर शाखा, प्रखंड-छातापुर,
पो. परियाती भाया सरपतगंज, सहरसा-852137
319. युनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया
नरघोषी शाखा, पो. सरायरंजन, खौरी रोड,
जि. समस्तीपुर-848111 (बिहार)
320. युनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया
नौर शाखा, प्रखंड-नवीनगर, पो. नौर,
जि. औरंगाबाद-824303 (बिहार)
321. युनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया
नबावगंज शाखा, प्रखंड-मनिहारी,
जि. कटिहार (बिहार)
322. युनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया
पाटलिपुत्रा कॉलोनी शाखा, 216, पी.पी. कॉलोनी,
पटना-800013 (बिहार)
323. युनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया
रूपौली शाखा, ग्राम-रूपौली,
पो. राजोरवर भाया अररिया,
(बिहार)
324. युनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया
ऊसरीशिकारपुर शाखा, न्यू ताराचक, पो. दानापुर कैंट
पटना-801503
- पंजाब नैशनल बैंक**
325. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
अंचल कार्यालय, 6-1-73,
सईद प्लाजा लकड़ी का पुल, हैदराबाद-500 004
326. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
मिड कार्पोरेट शाखा, रोड नं. 12, बंजारा हिल्स,
हैदराबाद-500 034
327. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
4/1/427, तुरुप बाजार, बैंक स्ट्रीट, हैदराबाद-500 001
328. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
डेकन चेम्बर्स, आल्विन भवन के सामने, एरांगुडा,
सनतनगर, हैदराबाद-500 018
329. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
राष्ट्रपति रोड, सिकंदराबाद-500 003
330. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
एलआईसी बिल्डिंग, जीवन प्रकाश रोड,
विशाखापट्टणम-500 002
331. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
महात्मा गांधी रोड, सिकंदराबाद-530 003
332. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
1-8-59, ग्रीन गेट, चिक्कड़पल्ली,
हैदराबाद-500 020
333. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
प्लॉट नं. 3 एण्ड 4, साईबाबा मैन्शन, विक्रमपुरी,
हब्शीगुडा, मेन रोड., हैदराबाद-500 007
334. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
क्यू 4, ए-3, पहली मंजिल,
साइबर टावर्स हाई टेक सिटी, माधापुर,
हैदराबाद-500 081
335. पंजाब नैशनल बैंक,
सरवर कॉम्प्लेक्स, फिसल बंडा मेन रोड, कंचनबाग,
हैदराबाद-500 059

336. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
16-1-545/5, सन्तोषनगर,
हैदराबाद
337. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
6-1-73, सईद प्शोजा, लकड़ी का पुल, सैफाबाद,
हैदराबाद-500 004
338. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
6-3-682/ए, ठाकुर मेशन, सौमाजीगुदा,
हैदराबाद-500 082
339. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
4, श्रीनगर कॉलोनी, लालबाजार,
सिकन्दराबाद-500 015
340. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
मनोविकास नगर, एनआईएमएच,
बोवेनपल्ली, सिकन्दराबाद
341. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शास्त्री रोड, कसीमनगर-505 001
342. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
40/29, पार्क रोड, कर्नूल-518 001
343. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
5-5-126/2, खलीलवाड़ी,
निजामाबाद-503 003
344. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
आल्बिन वाच डिवीजन के सामने, पटनचैर,
मेदक जिला-502 319
345. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
142, अमरावती होटल, टी पी एरिया,
तिरुपति-517 501
346. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
भीमारम शाखा, हनमकोण्डा ब्लॉक,
वरंगल जिला-506 015
347. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
नन्दीगाँव शाखा, शादनगर तालुका,
महबूबनगर जिला-509 223
348. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
क्षेत्रीय संसाधन केन्द्र, नेताजी भवन, हिमायतनगर,
हैदराबाद-500 029
349. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शाखा : कप्तानगंज,
कप्तानगंज मेन रोड, पोस्ट : कप्तानगंज,
तहसील : हाट, जिला : कुशीनगर (उ.प्र.),
पिनकोड : 274 301
350. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शाखा : गोला, मेर रोड गोला बाजार,
पोस्ट : गोलान बाजार, तहसील : गोला,
जिला : गोरखपुर (उ.प्र.),
पिनकोड : 274308
351. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शाखा : सलेमपुर, थाना कोतवाली के पास,
पोस्ट : सलेमपुर, तहसील : सलेमपुर,
जिला : देवरिया (उ.प्र.) पिनकोड : 274509
352. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शाखा जलसंस्थान, पता : 111/8,
कानपुर जलसंस्थान, बेनाझाबर कानपुर -208 002
353. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शाखा कन्नौज, पता : अशोक नगर, सरायमीरा,
जिला कन्नौज-209 725
354. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शाखा दिवियापुर, पता : विवेकानन्द ग्रामोद्योग विद्यालय
परिसर, बेला रोड-दिवियापुर, जिला-औरैया-206244
355. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शाखा हमीरपुर, पता : जेल तालाब रोड,
पोस्ट हमीरपुर जिला हमीरपुर
356. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शाखा बर्रा-8, पता : के डी एम ए परिसर,
बर्रा-8, कानपुर-208 027
357. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शाखा एंट, कृषि उपज मण्डी स्थल,
ब्लॉक डकौर, जिला-जालौन
- शाखा विशिष्ट संख्या : 4609
358. पंजाब नेशनल बैंक,
शाखा/कार्यालय : एम.ई.सी.एल. सीजी.ओ. कॉम्प्लेक्स,
सेमीनरी हिल्स, नागपुर, तहसील : नागपुर, जिला: नागपुर,
(महाराष्ट्र)
- इंडियन बैंक**
359. इंडियन बैंक
युवराज कंप्लेक्स डी एस 21, लोहिया नगर कंकड़बाग,
पटना-800 020
360. इंडियन बैंक
जगे शांति कंप्लेक्स, नेताजी रोड, देवघर-814112
- स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला**
361. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
सिविल लाईन्ज, बठिंडा (पंजाब)-151 005
362. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
ग्राम किकर बाजार, बठिंडा
(पंजाब)-151 005

363. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
मौड़, ग्राम तलवंडी साबो, जिला बठिंडा,
(पंजाब)-151 509
364. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
महिमा सरजा, जिला बठिंडा, (पंजाब)-151509
365. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
मेहराज, ग्राम रामपुरा फूल, जिला बठिंडा,
(पंजाब)-151105
366. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बालाघाली, ग्राम रामपुरा फूल, जिला बठिंडा,
(पंजाब)-151107
367. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
गोनिशाना तहसील एवं जिला बठिंडा, (पंजाब)
368. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
कोटफत्ता ग्राम कोटफत्ता, जिला बठिंडा, (पंजाब)
369. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
फूल टाउन, ग्राम रामपुरा फूल, जिला बठिंडा, (पंजाब)
370. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
रामां मण्डी, गऊशाला रोड, बठिंडा, (पंजाब)
371. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
तलवंडी साबो, ग्राम तलवंडी साबो,
जिला बठिंडा, (पंजाब)
372. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
रामपुरा फूल, रेलवे रोड,
जिला बठिंडा, (पंजाब)
373. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बठिंडा इण्डस्ट्रीयल एरिया,
पंजाब-151 001
374. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बठिंडा जी.एन.डी.टी.पी., गुरू नानक धरमल प्लांट,
बठिंडा (पंजाब)-151 002
375. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
भुचो कलां, वाया भुचो मण्डी,
तहसील एवं जिला बठिंडा,
पंजाब-151 101
376. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बठिंडा एम.एस.सी., म्युनिसिपल शॉपिंग कम्प्लैक्स,
बठिंडा पंजाब-151 101
377. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
विरक कलां, पोस्ट आफिस मोनियाना,
जिला बठिंडा पंजाब-151 201
378. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बीबी वाला, तहसील एवं जिला बठिंडा,
बठिंडा पंजाब-151 102
379. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
चौके, डाकखाना जोगा, जिला मानसा,
(पंजाब)
380. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
माईसरखाना, तहसील तलवंडी साबो,
जिला बठिंडा, (पंजाब)
381. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
तुंगवाली, तहसील एवं जिला बठिंडा,
(पंजाब)-151 101
382. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बल्लुआणा, डाकखाना बठिंडा,
पंजाब -151 001
383. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
सिंधो, डाकखाना सिंधो, तहसील तलवंडी साबो
जिला बठिंडा (पंजाब)
384. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
जलाल, तहसील फूल, जिला बठिंडा (पंजाब)
151 101
385. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
भुचो मण्डी, तहसील एवं जिला बठिंडा
(पंजाब)-151 101
386. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बठिंडा अनाज मण्डी (पंजाब)-151 001
387. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
शेख पुरा, जिला बठिंडा (पंजाब)
388. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
एयर फोर्स स्टेशन, भीसीआना,
तहसील एवं जिला बठिंडा (पंजाब)-151 201
389. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
कल्याण सुखा, डाकखाना कल्याण सुखा,
तहसील नथाना, जिला बठिंडा (पंजाब)
390. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
नथाना, तहसील एवं जिला बठिंडा (पंजाब)-151 102
391. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बांगी रूलदू, तहसील तलवंडी साबो,
जिला बठिंडा (पंजाब)
392. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बठिंडा, परस राम नगर,
जिला बठिंडा (पंजाब)-151 001

393. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बठिंडा सर्विस शाखा, जिला बठिंडा (पंजाब)-151 001
394. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बठिंडा कैंन्ट, जिला बठिंडा (पंजाब)-151 001
395. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बठिंडा माल, माल रोड, जिला बठिंडा (पंजाब)-151 001
396. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
भगता भाई का जैतो बरनाला रोड,
जिला बठिंडा (पंजाब)
397. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
कमरा नं. 1-2-3, डी.ए.सी. बठिंडा
(पंजाब)-151 005
398. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
कोटकपूरा, रेलवे रोड, जिला फरीदकोट (पंजाब)
399. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
जैतो, (बोहानंदी बाजार), तहसील एवं जिला फरीदकोट,
(पंजाब)-151 102
400. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
फरीदकोट मेन, दी माल, फरीदकोट, (पंजाब)-151 203
401. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
सादिक, तहसील एवं जिला फरीदकोट,
(पंजाब)-151 203
402. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
पंज गराई कलां, तहसील एवं जिला फरीदकोट,
(पंजाब)-151 207
403. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बरगाड़ी, तहसील एवं जिला फरीदकोट,
(पंजाब)-151 207
404. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
दिलवां कलां, पो. दिलवां कलां,
तहसील एवं जिला फरीदकोट,
(पंजाब)-151 204
405. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
वांदर जटाना, तहसील एवं जिला फरीदकोट, (पंजाब)
406. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
फरीदकोट, के.एन. जैन स्कूल, फरीदकोट,
जिला फरीदकोट, (पंजाब)
407. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
कोटकपूरा, (मोगा रोड), जिला फरीदकोट, (पंजाब)
408. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
न्यू कोर्टस, जीरा, तहसील जीरा, जिला फिरोजपुर,
(पंजाब)-142 047
409. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
फिरोजपुर, दी माल, जिला फिरोजपुर, (पंजाब)
410. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
अबोहर, तहसील एवं जिला फिरोजपुर,
(पंजाब)-152 116
411. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
फाजिल्का, गऊशाला रोड, जिला फिरोजपुर,
(पंजाब)-152 123
412. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
मुण्डी छुरी मारां (मखू) मखू तहसील जीरा,
जिला मुक्तसर (पंजाब)-142 051
413. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
फिरोजपुर कैंन्ट, बाजार नं. 2, फिरोजपुर कैंन्ट,
जिला फिरोजपुर (पंजाब)
414. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
जलालाबाद पश्चिम, बिमल पैलेस,
नजदीक पुराना बस स्टैंड, फिरोजपुर,
फिरोजपुर रोड, तहसील एवं जिला फिरोजपुर (पंजाब)
415. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
गुरु हर सहाय, तहसील एवं जिला फिरोजपुर (पंजाब)
416. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
तलवंडी भाई, गली नं. 5, नई आबादी, नई अनाज मंडी,
जिला बठिंडा (पंजाब)
417. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
निहाल सिंह वाला, तहसील एवं जिला मोगा,
(पंजाब)-142 055
418. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
धरमकोट, तहसील एवं जिला फिरोजपुर (पंजाब)
419. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
करयाल, तहसील जीरा, जिला मोगा (पंजाब)-142 042
420. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
जलालाबाद पूर्व, तहसील जीरा, जिला मोगा
(पंजाब)-142 058
421. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बागा पुराना, निहालसिंह वाला रोड,
जिला मोगा (पंजाब)
422. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
सिविल लाईन्ज, जी.टी. रोड, मोगा,
जिला मोगा (पंजाब)
423. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
मोगा (एम. सी.), म्यूनिसिपल कमेटी,
तहसील एवं जिला मोगा (पंजाब)-142 001

424. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बदनी कलां, तहसील निहालसिंह वाला,
जिला मोगा, (पंजाब)
425. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
मानसा मेन, सामने सिविल हस्पताल, जिला मानसा
(पंजाब)-151 505
426. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
मानसा (औद्योगिक क्षेत्र) जिला मानसा,
(पंजाब)-151 505
427. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बोहा, डाकखाना बोहा, जिला मानसा
(पंजाब)-151 503
428. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बरेठा, अनाज मंडी बरेठा, जिला मानसा
(पंजाब)
429. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बुढ़लाडा, (अनाज मंडी), जिला मानसा
(पंजाब)-151 502
430. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
झुबीर, जिला मानसा,
(पंजाब)-151 506
431. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
मानसा ए.डी.बी. जिला मानसा,
(पंजाब)-151 505
432. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
फत्ता मालूका, जिला मानसा,
(पंजाब) -151 505
433. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बैहणीवाल, डाकखाना बैहणीवाल, जिला मानसा
(पंजाब)
434. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
सरदूलगढ़, तहसील एवं जिला मानसा
(पंजाब) -151 507
435. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
ख्याला कलां, डाकखाना ख्याला कलां,
तहसील एवं जिला मानसा (पंजाब)
436. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
भीखी, जिला मानसा
(पंजाब) -151 504
437. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
बरेह, डाकखाना बरेह (Bareh), जिला मानसा
(पंजाब)
438. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
रल्ला, जिला मानसा, (पंजाब)
439. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
कोट भाई, तहसील मुक्तसर,
जिला मानसा (पंजाब)
440. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
गिदड़बाहा, जिला मुक्तसर (पंजाब)-152 001
441. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
मलोटा, तहसील मुक्तसर, जिला मुक्तसर
(पंजाब) 152 107
442. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
मुक्तसर, जिला फरीदकोट,
(पंजाब) 156 102
443. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
किलियां वाली, डाकखाना मंडी डबवाली,
तहसील एवं जिला मुक्तसर
(पंजाब) 152 104
444. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
भलाईआना, डाकखाना भलाईआना,
तहसील एवं जिला मुक्तसर
(पंजाब) 152 102
445. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
आलमवाला, तहसील एवं जिला फरीदकोट
(पंजाब)
446. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
गुरुसर मन्दिर, (गिदड़बाहा), डाकखाना गुरुसर मंदिर,
तहसील एवं जिला मुक्तसर
(पंजाब)
447. स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला
गिदड़बाहा (गुड़ मंडी), तहसील एवं जिला मुक्तसर,
(पंजाब) 152 001
- युनाइटेड इंडिया इंश्योरेंस कम्पनी लिमिटेड**
448. युनाइटेड इंडिया इंश्योरेंस कम्पनी लिमिटेड,
शाखा कार्यालय, प्रथम मंजिल, पुलिस गुरुद्वारा भवन,
पोस्ट बॉक्स नं. 30, अबरडीन बाजार,
पोर्ट ब्लेयर।
449. युनाइटेड इंडिया इंश्योरेंस कम्पनी लिमिटेड,
शाखा कार्यालय, 13 महेश्वरी रोड,
बडवाह, -451 115
450. युनाइटेड इंडिया इंश्योरेंस कम्पनी लिमिटेड,
शाखा कार्यालय, कृष्णा मंदिर, फालके बाजार,
ग्वालियर

451. युनाइटेड इंडिया इश्योरेंस कम्पनी लिमिटेड,
मण्डलीय कार्यालय-सेमरिया चौक, रीवा रोड,
सतना-485001 (मध्य प्रदेश)
452. युनाइटेड इंडिया इश्योरेंस कम्पनी लिमिटेड,
मंडल कार्यालय क्रमांक 4, इंदौर, 8/5, वाय एन. रोड,
गौ लोक बिल्डिंग, प्रथम तल, इंदौर, मध्य प्रदेश ।

(Department of Financial Services,

New Delhi, the 21st February, 2008

S.O. 415.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of rule, 10 of the Official Languages (Use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 the Central Government, hereby, notifies the listed branches/offices of the following Banks/Financial Institutions/Insurance Companies in the attached annexure, more than 80% of the staff whereof have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi.

Serial No.	Name of the Bank/Financial Institutions/Insurance Companies	Number of Branches/Offices
1.	Oriental Bank of Commerce	114
2.	Canara Bank	126
3.	Syndicate Bank	70
4.	United Bank of India	14
5.	Punjab National Bank	34
6.	Indian Bank	02
7.	State Bank of Patiala	87
8.	United India Insurance Company Limited	05
Total		452

[F.No. 11016/2/2008-Hindi]

REMESH BABU ANIYERY, Jt. Director (OL)

ANNEXURE

ORIENTAL BANK OF COMMERCE

Lucknow Region

- Oriental Bank of Commerce
Hotel Gonard, Civil Line,
Gonda-271001
- Oriental Bank of Commerce
Plot No. C-459, Avas Vikas Colony, Opp. LIC,
Hardoi, Pin-241001
- Oriental Bank of Commerce
APS Academi, Sainani Vihar,
Haibatmau, Mawaiya, Rai Bareilly Road,
Lucknow-226026

- Oriental Bank of Commerce^a
State Plaza, Sahara Estate, Jankipuram,
Lucknow-226023
- Oriental Bank of Commerce
Swami Vivekanand Inter College, Ashiana Road,
Sector-K, Lucknow-226012
- Oriental Bank of Commerce
U.P. Ganna Kisan Sansthan, 11, Butler Place, Tilak
Marg, Dalibagh, Lucknow-226001
- Oriental Bank of Commerce
Hanuman Prasad Rastogi, Inter Girls College,
Subhash Marg, Lucknow-226003
- Oriental Bank of Commerce
Rama Devi Balika Inter College, 497 Meerapur,
Allahabad-211002
- Oriental Bank of Commerce
Dharm Sangh Siksha Mandal, Durgakund,
Varanasi-221010
- Oriental Bank of Commerce
Chitra Inter College, 81, Y-Block, Hamirpur,
Naubasta, Kanpur
- Oriental Bank of Commerce
U.P. Avas Vikas Parishad, Yojna No, 1, H.I.G.-131,
Kalyanpur, Kanpur, PIN-208024
- Oriental Bank of Commerce
P.V.N. College, D-587, Opp. Kargil Petrol Pump,
Barra 8, Kanpur, PIN-208027
- Oriental Bank of Commerce
H. N. Inter College, Harijinder Nagar,
Kanpur-208007
- Oriental Bank of Commerce
Uma Nath Singh Institute, VBS Purvanchal
University Campus, Jaunpur-222001

Dehradun Region

- Oriental Bank of Commerce
Institute of Management Studies, 21,
New Cantt. Road, Dehradun-248001
- Oriental Bank of Commerce
57/1-S, Arya Shopping Complex,
Indra Nagar Colony, Vasant Vihar, Phase-1,
Dehradun-248006
- Oriental Bank of Commerce
A-160, Nehru Colony,
Dehradun-248001
- Oriental Bank of Commerce
Saket 78, Rajpur Road,
Dehradun-248002
- Oriental Bank of Commerce
Patel Nagar, Saharanpur Road,
Dehradun-248001

20. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Nagar Palika Parishad, Mayapur, Hardwar,
PIN-249401
 21. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Chinnmaya Degree College, Shivalik Nagar,
Bhel Ranipur Road, Hardwar-249403
 22. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Rana Market, Main Road, Jalalabad, Teh. Shamli,
Distt. Muzaffarnagar, PIN-247772
 23. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Near Police Station, Badrinath Marg, Kotdwar,
Distt. Pauri Garhwal, PIN-246149
 24. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Vill. & P.O. Shikhera, Meerapur Jansath Road,
Teh. Jansath, Distt. Mujaffarnagar-247777
 25. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Saharanpur Road, Opp. Petrol Pump, Herbertpur,
Distt. Dehradun
 26. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Distt. Coordinator Office Shanti Bhawan,
Ambala Road, Saharanpur,
PIN-247001
- Ghaziabad Region**
27. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Institute of Management Studies, Lal Kuan,
Ghaziabad, -201 001
 28. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Aryan Public School, Sector-4, Vaishali,
Ghaziabad-201010
 29. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Diwakar Model School, Shyam Park Extension,
Sahibabad, Ghaziabad,
PIN-201005
 30. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Mewar, Institute of Management, Sector-4/C,
Vasundhara, Ghaziabad,
PIN: 201 001
 31. Oriental Bank of Commerce
VIET, Vill. Beel Akbarpur Dadri,
Ghaziabad, Buland Shahar,
Distt. Gautam Budh Nagar,
PIN: 201002
 32. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Village Kinnoni, Block Rohta at Factory, Premises,
Bajaj Hindustan Ltd. Distt. Meerut,
PIN: 250340
 33. Oriental Bank of Commerce
12 Field Regiment, Top Khanna, Cantt. Meerut,
PIN: 250001
 34. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Lokpriya Nursing Home, Samrat Palace,
Garh Road, Meerut-250004
 35. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Subharti Dental College, Bye Pass Road,
Delhi-Mussorie Highway,
Meerut-250004
 36. Oriental Bank of Commerce
A.P.J. School, Sector-16A, Noida,
Distt. Gautam Budh Nagar,
PIN: 201301
 37. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Alliance International School, C-54A, Sector-56,
Noida, Distt. Gautam Budh Nagar,
PIN: 201301
 38. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Shop No. 29-30, Distt. Court,
Compound Phase-II,
Noida, Distt. Gautam Budh Nagar,
PIN: 201301
 39. Oriental Bank of Commerce
G-57, 58, Sector-13, Noida,
Distt. Gautam Budh Nagar,
PIN: 201301
 40. Oriental Bank of Commerce
A-211, Sector A/4, Tronica City,
Distt. Ghaziabad,
PIN: 201102
 41. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Chauhan Chowk, Hastinapur Road,
Near Police Station Mawana,
Distt. Meerut-250401
 42. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Plot No. 512, Niti Khand-I, Indrapuram,
Distt. Ghaziabad,
PIN: 201001
 43. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Shop No. 16, 12-B, Market Sector-34, Noida,
PIN: 201301
 44. Oriental Bank of Commerce
C-1, Sector-61, Noida, Distt. Gautam Budh Nagar,
PIN: 201301
 45. Oriental Bank of Commerce
I.E.M.L. Plot No.-25, 27, 28 & 29,
Knowledge Park Second, Greater Noida,
Distt. Gautam Budh Nagar-201305
 46. Oriental Bank of Commerce
Currency Chest, Ground Floor, Back Side,
K.J.-13, Kavi Nagar,
Ghaziabad-201002
 47. Oriental Bank of Commerce
District Coordinator Office 1st Floor,
K.J.-13, Kavi Nagar,
Ghaziabad-201002

48 Oriental Bank of Commerce
District Coordinator Office Sadar Bazar,
Meerut Cantt.
PIN-250002

New Delhi Region

- 49 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Modern School, Vasant Vihar,
New Delhi-110057
- 50 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Plot No. 20, 1st Floor, Central Market,
Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075
- 51 Oriental Bank of Commerce
N.K. Bagrodia Public School, Sector-4, Dwarka,
New Delhi-110078
- 52 Oriental Bank of Commerce
M.R. Vivekanand Model School,
Sector-13, Dwarka,
New Delhi-110078
- 53 Oriental Bank of Commerce
D.A.V. Public School, Kailash Hills,
New Delhi-110065
- 54 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Deen Dayal Upadhyaya College,
Shivaji Marg, Karampura,
New Delhi-110015
- 55 Oriental Bank of Commerce
M.R. Vivekanand Model School, WZ-79C,
Mukhran Park, Tilak Nagar,
New Delhi-110018
- 56 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Tagore School, 18, Mayapuri Road,
New Delhi-110064
- 57 Oriental Bank of Commerce
M.S.D. Flats, Minto Road Complex,
New Delhi-110067
- 58 Oriental Bank of Commerce
B-1/A-14, Mohan Co-Op Industrial Estate,
Mathura Road,
New Delhi-110076
- 59 Oriental Bank of Commerce
DAV Public School, RBI Enclave,
Paschim Vihar,
New Delhi-110063
- 60 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Maharaja Agrasen Hospital, Charitable Trust
(Regd.), Road No. 35, Punjabi Bagh (West),
New Delhi-110060
- 61 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Aita Trust R.K. Khanna Tennis Stadium, Africa
Avenue, R. K. Puram, Opp. Sector-2,
New Delhi-110029

62 Oriental Bank of Commerce
59/17, Ground Floor, Main Road, Kalkaji Extension,
New Delhi-110019

63 Oriental Bank of Commerce
M-1, 2, 3 Connaught Circus, Connaught Place,
New Delhi-110001

64 Oriental Bank of Commerce
C-Block, Paschim Marg, Vasant Vihar,
New Delhi-110057

65 Oriental Bank of Commerce
E-38, Greater Kailash-I
New Delhi-110048

66 Oriental Bank of Commerce
E-14, South Extension, Part-II,
New Delhi-110049

67 Oriental Bank of Commerce
D-7, Palam Dabri Road, Mahavir Enclave, Palam,
New Delhi-110045

68 Oriental Bank of Commerce
35, North West Avenue, Punjabi Bagh, Club Road,
New Delhi-110026

69 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Currency Chest 4E, Jhandewalan Extension,
New Delhi-110057

Delhi Region

- 70 Oriental Bank of Commerce
L.S.C. B-Block, Mayur Vihar, Phase-II,
New Delhi-110091
- 71 Oriental Bank of Commerce
F-21, Preet Vihar, Main Vikas Marg,
New Delhi-110092

Agra Region

- 72 Oriental Bank of Commerce
D-507, Hotel Woodland Building,
Kamla Nagar, 282002
- 73 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Tehsil Sadar, Opp. Police Line,
Agra-282010
- 74 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Gyan Sthali Public School, Shivaji Nagar,
Jhansi-284001
- 75 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Service Branch, Basement,
E-15/8, Prince Tower
Sanjay Place Agra-282 002
- 76 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Currency Chest, 71-B, Bank Colony,
Opp. Subhash Park, M.G. Road,
Agra-282001

Jaipur Region

- 77 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Opp. Swagat Bhavan, UIT Campus,
Bharatpur-321001
- 78 Oriental Bank of Commerce
UTI Bhiwadi, Sector-1, (Distt. : Alwar)
Pin-301019
- 79 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Kothari Bhawan, Sadar Bazar,
P.O. : Degana, Distt. Nagaur, Pin-341503
- 80 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Choparia Bazar, Jhalrapatan, City, Jhalawar,
- 81 Oriental Bank of Commerce
B-1/20, Gandhi Path, Chitrakoot,
Jaipur-302021
- 82 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Keshav Vidyapeeth Samiti, Vill. Jamdoli,
(Distt. : Jaipur)
- 83 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Rajasthan State Agriculture & Marketing Board,
Pant Krishi Bhawan, Jaipur-302005
- 84 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Show Room 44-47, & 61-62, A-5, Central Spine,
Agrasen Tower, Vidyadhar Nagar,
Jaipur-302012
- 85 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Sangam Tower, Ground Floor, Church Road,
Jaipur-302021
- 86 Oriental Bank of Commerce
D.R.D.A. Collectrate, Jodhpur
- 87 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Happy Hours School
Ajit Bhawan, near Circuit House Jodhpur
- 88 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Shree Sumer Senior Higher
Secondary School, Mahamandir
Mandor Road Jodhpur
- 89 Oriental Bank of Commerce
489-B, Nikhar Bhawan Kamla Nehru Nagar
Chosani Road Jodhpur
- 90 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Plot No. 937, 10th D Road
Sadarpura, Jodhpur
- 91 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Krishi Upaj Mandi Samiti
Anantpura, Kota
- 92 Oriental Bank of Commerce
518, A.S.C. Bn. T-35, Eastern
Enclave, Kota Military Station Kota

- 93 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Indra Vihar Colony
RIICO Building
Kota-324005
- 94 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Jain Vishwa Bharti Institute
Premises, Post Box No. 12
Ladnun (Distt. Nagaur)
Pin-341306
- 95 Oriental Bank of Commerce
3-K.P. Apartments, Hiran Magri
Sector-4, Udaipur
Pin-303001
- 96 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Sevice Branch
B-23, Raja Mansion
Opp. Parnami Mandir, Govind Marg
Adarsh Nagar, Jaipur
- 97 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Currency Chest
Near Old Octroi Check Post,
Ajmer Road, Jaipur-302006

Bhopal Region

- 98 Oriental Bank of Commerce
All Saints School,
Idgah Hills
Bhopal-462002
- 99 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Municipal Corporation,
Zone-6, Harshawardhan Complex,
Awant Bai Chouraha,
Tulsi Nagar, Bhopal-462003
- 100 Oriental Bank of Commerce
6, Station Road,
Dewas-455001
- 101 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Mansik Arogyashal
(M. P.) Jail Road,
Gwalior-474009
- 102 Oriental Bank of Commerce
Special Area Development Authority
Plot No. 12, City Centre
Gwalior-474009

Karnal Region

- 103 Oriental Bank of Commerce
M. M. College of Dental Science and Research
Mulana Complex
Mulana
- 104 Oriental Bank of Commerce
N. C. Engineering College
Israna-132107

105 Oriental Bank Of Commerce
Sector-12, Urban State
Karnal-132101

106 Oriental Bank Of Commerce
Seth Jai Prakash Mukund Lal Institute
of Engineering & Technology
Cheta Bans, Radaur

107 Oriental Bank Of Commerce
Currency Chest M-4, Industrial Area,
Panipat-132103

Bareilly Region

108 Oriental Bank Of Commerce
Shi Ram Murti Medical Smarak Trust,
Bareilly

109 Oriental Bank Of Commerce
Springdale College
Pilibhit Bypass, Bichpari Road,
Bareilly

Rohtak Region

110 Oriental Bank Of Commerce
Vaish Senior Secondary School,
Siksha Marg,
Bhiwani-127021

111 Oriental Bank Of Commerce
Opposite Police Station,
Patiala Road,
Jakhal (Distt. Fatehabad)
Pin-125133

112 Oriental Bank Of Commerce
M.D.N. Public School,
Near Bus Stand
Rohtak-124001

113 Oriental Bank Of Commerce
Currency Chest
97, Ground Floor,
Near Mansarovar Park,
Sonapat Road, Rohtak-124001

Gurgaon Region

114 Oriental Bank Of Commerce
Shop No. 101/102,
Shop N Park Mkt, DLF-II
Gurgaon-122001

CANARA BANK

115. Canara Bank
Bagalur Branch Devanahaali Taluk, Bangalore,
Dist-562149 Karnataka

116. Canara Bank
B T M Layout Branch 57 & 58, BTM 1st Stage,
II Mian Road, 100 Ft. Road B.G. Circle, B T M
Layout Bangalore -560076 Karnataka

117. Canara Bank
BDA Complex Branch, Ground Floor,
B D A Annexe Building, Chowdaiah Road,
Bangalore - 560020 Karnataka

118. Canara Bank
Corporate Consumer Finance Branch,
4/1, Walton Road Lavelle Road,
Bangalore -560001 Karnataka

119. Canara Bank
Devarajeevanahalli Branch, No. 19, 15th Cross
Sagayapur Devis Road, Bangalore-560005,
Karnataka

120. Canara Bank
Girinagar Branch, No 405, J.P. Road,
Vishwabharathi Housing Complex Girinagar,
Bangalore - 560 085, Karnataka

121. Canara Bank
HAL III Stage Branch, No.1, Annapoorneshwari
Complex, Opp. B E M L, New Thippasandra
HAL III Stage, Bangalore - 560075
Karnataka

122. Canara Bank
Housign Finance Branch 96, I Floor,
South End Road Bangalore - 560 004
Karnataka

123. Canara Bank
Infantry Road Branch No. 1, Infantry Road,
Bangalore - 560 001 Karnataka

124. Canara Bank
J P Nagar II Phase Branch 827, 24th Main,
12th Cross J P Nagar II Phase Bangalore - 560078
Karnataka.

125. Canara Bank
Jayanagar IVth T Block 364,
16th Main Road 4th T Block, Jayanagar
Bangalore - 560011
Karnataka

126. Canara Bank
H S R Layout Branch, 145, Teacher's Colony
5th Sector Ring Road, Koramangala
Bangalore -560 034, Karnataka

127. Canara Bank
KSFC Branch, KSFC Complex
No. 1/1, Thimmaiah Road, Bangalore - 560 052
Karnataka
128. Canara Bank
Madiwala Branch, 21/01, Hosur Main Road,
Madiwala Bangalore - 560 068
Karnataka
129. Canara Bank
Malleshwaram Branch, P B No. 307, 38&39,
Vth Cross Road, Bangalore - 560 003
Karnataka
130. Canara Bank
MICO Branch Bannerghatta Road Audogodi,
Bangalore - 560 030 Karnataka
131. Canara Bank
Neelasandra Branch 38/6, 38/7, 38/16,
Bazaar Street, Neelasandra Bangalore - 560047
Karnataka
132. Canara Bank
Padmanabhanagar Branch, 17/3, (New No.25)
Satyan Complex Bendrenagar Circle,
Padmanabhanagar Bangalore - 560 071
Karnataka
133. Canara Bank
Rajajinagar III Block Branch 628, 629, III Block,
Rajajinagar III Block Bangalore - 560010
Karnataka
134. Canara Bank
Sampangirama nagar Branch 12/2,
Lalbagh Road, Sampangirama nagar
Bangalore-560 027,
Karnataka
135. Canara Bank
Sarakki layout Branch No 220, 46th Cross,
8th Block, Jayanagar Bangalore-560 011
Karnataka
136. Canara Bank
Sheshadripuram Branch, P B No. 2047, 179
Roopa Complex, 1 st Main Sheshadripuram,
Bangalore-560 020 Karnataka
137. Canara Bank
Bangalore Stock Exchange Branch,
51, II Floor, Stock Exchange Towers Incross,
J C Road, Bangalore - 560 027
Karnataka
138. Canara Bank
MICR Centre Bangalore Karnataka
139. Canara Bank
Halasur, P B No. 883, 18/1 Cambridge Road
Bangalore - 560 008 Karnataka
140. Canara Bank
Vidyaranyapura Branch, 194, 1 st Block, 1st Cross,
N T I Layout Vidyaranyapura Bangalore - 560 040
Karnataka
141. Canara Bank
Viveknagar Branch, 99, Vannarpet lay out
1st Main Road, Viveknagar Bangalore-560 047,
Karnataka
142. Canara Bank
Chandapur Circle Branch, 140, Hosur Road
Chandapur Circle Attibele Marg,
Bangalore Dist-562 145 Karnataka
143. Canara Bank
SSI Mahadevapura Branch Bangalore,
Karnataka
144. Canara Bank
Baragur Branch Main Road, Baragur SIRA Taluk
Tumkur Dist - 572 113, Karnataka
145. Canara Bank
Honnaganahalli Branch Kanakapura Taluk,
Bangalore Dist-562 126, Karnataka
146. Canara Bank
Kuluvanahalli Branch Nelamangala Taluk,
Bangalore Dist-562 111, Karnataka
147. Canara Bank
Shivaganga Branch Nelamangala Taluk,
Bangalore Dist-562 111 Karnataka
148. Canara Bank
Tymagondlu Branch, No. 1078, P B No.1,
Tumkur - Bangalore Mian Road Tymagondlu,
Bangalore-562 132 Karnataka
149. Canara Bank
Lead Bank Lead Bank Office Akkamahadevi
Road, P J Extension Road, Davanagere-577 002,
Karnataka
150. Canara Bank
Ramagiri Branch, Gurusadan,
Near Railway Station Ramagiri, Holalkere Taluk
Chitradurga Dist-577 539 Karnataka
151. Canara Bank
Kyalanur Branch, Shreenivasa Nilaya Maruthi
Road, Kyalanur Kolar Dist-563 133,
Karnataka
152. Canara Bank,
Basaralu Branch Main Road, Basaralu,
Mandya Dist-571 416 Karnataka
153. Canara Bank
Hittanahalli Branch, Malavalli Taluk,
Mandya Taluk-571424, Karnataka

154. Canara Bank
Jayalakshmiipuram Branch No.8, Ganga
Temple Road, Jayalakshmiipuram,
Mysore - 570012, Karnataka
155. Canara Bank
Saraswathipuram Branch 120, "Hamsini",
P B No.6, 10th Main, VI Cross Saraswathipuram,
Mysore-570 009, Karnataka
156. Canara Bank
Mysore Industrial Suburb Treasure House,
P B No. 304 Manathodi Road, Industrial Suburb
Mysore - 570 008 Karnataka
157. Canara Bank
Nagamangala Branch, Bangalore-Mysore Road,
Nagamangala Mandya Dist-571 432 Karnataka
158. Canara Bank
Sindhghatta Branch, Mandya Dist 571 465
Karnataka
159. Canara Bank
T' Narasipura Branch, Post-Office Road, No.872
T' Narasipura Mysore Dist - 571 124 Karnataka
160. Canara Bank
L VD College Raichur Branch L VD College Road,
Raichur-584 103, Karnataka
161. Canara Bank
Currency Chest, Basement Portion Krishik Samaj
Building, Hudson Circle, Nrupatunga Road,
Bangalore - 560 002 Karnataka
162. Canara Bank
Currency Chest, Chitradurga B D Road,
Chitradurga-577501 Karnataka
163. Canara Bank
Currency Chest, Gulbarga Building No.132,
Super Market Opp. Telephone Exchange,
Gulbarga - 585 101 Karnataka
164. Canara Bank
Currency Chest, Raichur No.10-2-29,
City Talkies Road, Mahabaleshwar Chowk,
Raichur - 584 102 Karnataka
165. Canara Bank
Arakere, Bannerghatta Road
Branch No. 225-226,
Near A G N Kalyan Mantap Bannerghatta Road,
Bangalore-560 076, Karnataka
166. Canara Bank
Kurubarahalli Branch, No. 91/1, Pipeline Road
J.C. Nagar, Kurubarahalli,
Bangalore- 560 086, Karnataka
167. Canara Bank
Accounts Section, Bangalore, "Krishi Bhavan",
Near Police Corner, Nrupatunga Road, PB No.
5471, Bangalore- 560 002, Karnataka
168. Canara Bank
Lead Bank Office, Bangalore Urban, 29, M N K
Rao Park Road, Basavanagudi,
Bangalore- 560 004 Karnataka
169. Canara Bank
Lead Bank Office, II Cross, New Extension, P. B.
No. 2, Kolar-563101, Karnataka
170. Canara Bank
Currency Chest, Mysore, Canara Bank Bhavan,
26/A, Guest House Road, Nazarbad, Mysore-
570010, Karnataka
171. Canara Bank
Agriculture Finance Branch, No. 13/10, 3rd Cross,
CSI, CMPD, I Floor, Block Unity Building,
Bangalore- 560 002, Karnataka
172. Canara Bank
Basavanagudi Branch, Post Box No. 493,
180/1, Gandhinagar, Basavanagudi,
Bangalore- 560 004, Karnataka
173. Canara Bank
Benson Town Branch, P B No. 4608, 18/A, Millers
Road, Benson Town, Bangalore- 560 046,
Karnataka
174. Canara Bank
D'Costa Square Branch, No. 98/1-2, Wheeler
Road, Cook Town, Bangalore-560 005,
Karnataka
175. Canara Bank
Frazer Town Branch,
86/3, Coles Road, Bangalore- 560 005,
Karnataka
176. Canara Bank
Gokula Branch, 438/C, H M T Main Road,
Bangalore- 560 054, Karnataka
177. Canara Bank
Hombegowdanagar Branch, No. 211/62, 11th
Cross, Wilson Garden, Hombegowdanagar,
Bangalore- 560 027, Karnataka
178. Canara Bank
Industrial Finance Branch, Venkatadri Complex,
No. 83, Richmond Road, Bangalore- 560 025,
Karnataka
179. Canara Bank
ISRO Layout Branch, 218, 1st Main Road, 2nd
Cross, ISRO Layout, Bangalore- 560 078,
Karnataka

180. Canara Bank
Jayanagar Shopping Complex Branch,
PB No. 1611, Jayanagar, Shopping Complex,
Bangalore- 560 011, Karnataka
181. Canara Bank
Kodandarampuram Branch, PB No. 391,
Shanmukha No. 78, I Temple Road, 11th Cross,
Malleshwaram, Bangalore- 560 003, Karnataka
182. Canara Bank
Koramanagala Layout Branch, PB No. 3421,
No. 348, 100ft. Road, 4th Block, Koramanagala
Layout, Bangalore- 560 034, Karnataka
183. Canara Bank
Lottegollahalli Branch, 9, Chamundi Complex,
Ring Road, Maruthi Nagar, RM V II Stage,
Lottegollahalli, Bangalore- 560 094, Karnataka
184. Canara Bank
Mahila Banking Branch, Jayanagar III Block,
Bangalore- 560 011, Karnataka
185. Canara Bank
Marathhalli Branch, 453/418, Channakeshava
Nivas, Marathhalli Road, Marathhalli,
Bangalore- 560 037, Karnataka
186. Canara Bank
Asset Recovery Management Branch, III Floor,
Spencer's Towers, No. 86, M. G. Road,
Bangalore- 560 001, Karnataka
187. Canara Bank
NRI Branch, Shankar Narayan Building, Ground
Floor, 25, M. G. Road,
Bangalore- 560 001, Karnataka
188. Canara Bank
Peenya SSI Branch, No. 4, K S S I D C,
Multistoried Industrial Complex, 6th Main, II
Stage, Peenya, Bangalore- 560 058, Karnataka
189. Canara Bank
Sahakaranagar Branch, Site No. 529, Main Road,
Sahakaranagar, Bellari Road, Bangalore- 560 092,
Karnataka
190. Canara Bank
Sanjaynagar Branch, Bangalore, Karnataka
191. Canara Bank
Shanthinagar Branch,
18, Kengal Hanumanthaiah Road,
Shanthinagar, Bangalore- 560 027, Karnataka
192. Canara Bank
Sri Sathya Sai Branch, Brindavan, Whitefield,
Kadugodi, Bangalore- 560 027, Karnataka
193. Canara Bank
Subramanyanagar Branch,
4216, 1st Main Road, Subramanyanagar,
Bangalore- 560 021, Karnataka
194. Canara Bank
Tumkur Road Branch, Bangalore-Tumkur Road,
14, Industrial Suburb, Yashwanthpur,
Bangalore- 560 022, Karnataka
195. Canara Bank
Uttarahalli Branch, No. 1, Uttarahalli Circle,
Bangalore- 560 061, Karnataka
196. Canara Bank
Vishweshwarapuram Branch,
P. B. No. 490, 550, Vishweshwara Diagonal Road,
Vishweshwarapuram,
Bangalore- 560 004, Karnataka
197. Canara Bank
Begur Branch, Mary Nilaya Joseph Garden,
Begur, Bangalore- 560 068, Karnataka
198. Canara Bank
Chickabidirakallu Branch, Chickaibdirakallu,
Bangalore- 560 073, Karnataka
199. Canara Bank
Doddakannahalli Branch,
Rainbow Drive Layout, Doddakannahalli,
Sarjapur Road, Bangalore, Karnataka
200. Canara Bank
Harohalli Branch Kempaiah Building,
Bus Stand, Harohalli Bangalore Dist-562 112
Karnataka
201. Canara Bank
Huliyar Branch, Opp. Girls Middle School,
Huliyar, Tumkur Dist-572 218, Karnataka
202. Canara Bank
Madalur Branch, Sira Taluk,
Tumkur Dist - 572 137 Karnataka
203. Canara Bank
Chamarajanagar Branch Post Box No. 2
Chamarajanaga Mysore, Dist-571313, Karnataka
204. Canara Bank
Veeregowdanadoddi Branch,
Magadi Main Road Veeregowdanadoddi.
Magadi Taluk, Bangalore Dist-561201,
Karnataka
205. Canara Bank
Janakal Branch No. 406,
Main Road Janakal, Hosadurga Taluk
Chitradurga Dist-577527 Karnataka
206. Canara Bank
Beechiganhalli Branch,
Srikantaiah Building, Beechiganahalli Gudibanda,
Taluk Kolar Dist-561209, Karnataka
207. Canara Bank
Arakere Branch, Dr. Govind Gowda Premises,
P. B. No.1, Main Road Arakere, Mysore
Dist-571415, Karnataka

208. Canara Bank
Bettadapura Branch, Piriypattana Road Mysore
Dist-571102, Karnataka
209. Canara Bank
Mandya Branch, No.1572, P B No. 2
Mandya- 571401 Karnataka
210. Canara Bank
Nazarbhad Branch Ground Floor 26/ A,
C B Bhavan Guest House Road, Nazarbhad,
Mysore-570010, Karnataka
211. Canara Bank
Siddarthanagar Branch No. 6, Siddarthanagar,
Mysore-570 010, Karnataka
212. Canara Bank
Yivekanandanagar Branch, Mysore,
Karnataka
213. Canara Bank
Nanjanagudu Branch, 1692,
Priya Complex, P B No. 4,
Nanjanagudu Mysore Dist-571301,
Karnataka
214. Canara Bank
Shrirangapattana Branch 1st Floor, 692,
Main Road, Shrirangapattana, Mandya
Dist-571438, Karnataka
215. Canara Bank
Malkhed Adityanagar Branch, Malkhed
Sedam, Karnataka
216. Canara Bank
Mahalingapura Branch, Near Basaveshwara Circle
Main Road, Mahalingapura,
Mudhol Taluk, Bagalkot Dist-587312,
Karnataka
217. Canara Bank
H O Currency Chest, Basement, 112,
J. C. Road Bangalore-560002, Karnataka
218. Canara Bank
Currency Chest, Davanagere No. 1182/2,
K. R. Road, B T Oil Mill Compound,
Davanagere-577001, Karnataka
219. Canara Bank
Currency Chest, Bellary, District Chamber of
Commerce Building K. C. Road, Bellary-583101
Karnataka
220. Canara Bank
Currency Chest, Tumkur Hazrath Madar Shah
Makan, Ashoka Road, Tumkur-572102,
Karnataka
221. Canara Bank
G K V K Branch, University of Agriculture
Science Bellary Road, Bangalore-560 065,
Karnataka
222. Canara Bank
Neralur Branch,
Jagalur Post, Channapattana Taluk, Bangalore
Dist-562138, Karnataka
223. Canara Bank
Currency Chest. No. 39, 8th Main 5th Cross,
Rajamahar Vilas Extension,
Sadashivanagar, Bangalore-560080,
Karnataka
224. Canara Bank
Lead Bank Office, Bangalore Rural Chittapurmutt
Complex, 8th Main, 15th Cross Malleshwaram,
Bangalore-560005. Karnataka
225. Canara Bank
Currency Chest, Chintamani, " Swamy Krupa",
Politechnic Road Chintamani-563125
Karnataka
226. Canara Bank
Lead Bank Office, Chitradurga 2584/470,
B. R. Road P B No. 20. Chitradurga-577501,
Karnataka
227. Canara Bank
Kengeri Satellite Town, No. 6, 80 Ft. Road,
Outer Ring Road, Kengeri Satellite Town,
Bangalore-560060, Karnataka
228. Canara Bank
New BEL Road, MS Ramiah Medical Teaching
Hospital, New BEL Road, Bangalore-560054,
Karnataka
229. Canara Bank
Rajarajeswari Nagar, No. 118, 12th Cross,
Ideal Homes Building, Cooperative Society,
Rajarajeswari Circle Rajarajeswari Nagar,
Bangalore-560008, Karnataka
230. Canara Bank
Bagalgunte, No. 5, Hesaraghatta Road,
Bagalgunte, Bangalore-560073,
Karnataka
231. Canara Bank
Narayan Vihar Branch, Imperial Tower,
M S Plot Flat, G F/H L E-I, & BS-I,
Community Centre, New Delhi-100028
232. Canara Bank Dwaraka Branch, Pocket-6,
Sector-12, New Delhi-110075
233. Canara Bank
Ranjendra Nagar Branch,
DAV Public School, Sahibabad,
Gaziabad-201 005, Uttar Pradesh.
234. Canara Bank
SCO-11, Sector-16 Branch,
Faridabad-121 002, Haryana

235. Canara Bank
NCO, 34 & 35, Sector 10A Branch,
Gurgaon -122 002 Haryana.
236. Canara Bank
Hansraj College Branch, (University of Delhi),
Mahatma Hansraj College Marg, Delhi-110007
237. Canara Bank
Supreme Plaza, 1st Floor, Plot No.15, Sector-6,
Dwarka Branch, New Delhi-110075
238. Canara Bank
PAC 47 Battalion, Govindapuram Branch,
Gaziabad-201 001, Uttar Pradesh
239. Canara Bank
NCO 2&3, HUDA Shopping Complex, Sector-9
Branch, Faridabad-121 001 Haryana
240. Canara Bank
DLF Enclave Branch SG-27/28, DLF Glaria,
Phase-IV, DLF City, Gurgaon -122 002 Haryana.
- Syndicate Bank**
241. Syndicate Bank
TT Nagar Bhopal Branch No. 75, Malviya Nagar
Plot No. 71, Ground Floor Roshanapura Square
TT Nagar, Bhopal State: Madhya Pradesh
Pin : 462 003
242. Syndicate Bank
Narsinghpur Branch C/o Naveen Roadways
Behari Road Street, Narsinghpur
Dist : Narsinghpur State: Madhya Pradesh,
Pin : 487 001
243. Syndicate Bank
Katni Branch Dr. Nigam Building Station Road,
Katni State:Madhya Pradesh Pin: 483 501
244. Syndicate Bank
Itarsi Branch Near B.S.N.L. Office Dayal Complex
Gandhi Nagar, Itarsi Dist: Hoshangabad
State: Madhya Pradesh Pin: 461 111
245. Syndicate Bank
Ambala City S A Jain Model School Branch,
SA Jain Sr. Model School Circular Road
Ambala City Distt - Ambala State: Haryana
Pin: 134 003
246. Syndicate Bank
Amritsar Majitha Road Branch,
182/1, Main Majitha Road, Ganda Singh Wala,
Amritsar, Dist : Amritsar State: Punjab,
Pin : 143 004
247. Syndicate Bank
Amritsar Ranjit Avenue Branch SCO-40
Distt. Shopping Centre,
Ranjit Avenue Amritsar, Dist : Amritsar State:
Punjab Pin: 143 001
248. Syndicate Bank
Chandigarh Sector-47 Branch,
Mount Carmel School, Sector-47 Chandigarh
Dist : Chandigarh, State Chandigarh,
(U.T.), Pin 160 047
249. Syndicate Bank
Chandigarh Sector 36-A, Branch,
Punjab State Board of Technical Education,
Sector-36 A Chandigarh
Dist : Chandigarh State: Chandigarh (U.T.)
Pin: 160036
250. Syndicate Bank
Gurdaspur Branch Commercial Plot No.1,
Scheme No. 1 Improvement Trust Colony
G.T. Road, Gurdaspur Dist : Gurdaspur
State : Punjab Pin: 143 501
251. Syndicate Bank
Hissar Azad Nagar Branch,
Millennium Public School, Rajgarh Road,
Azad Nagar, Hissar Dist : Hissar
State: Haryana Pin : 125 001
252. Syndicate Bank
Yamuna Nagar Jagadhari Branch,
Bhagwan Parshuram Mandir, Ambala Road,
Jagadhari District : Yamuna Nagar
State : Haryana Pin : 135 003
253. Syndicate Bank
Jalandhar Army Public School
Branch, Campus of Armed Forces,
Jalandhar Cantt.
Dist. : Jalandhar State: Punjab Pin: 144 005
254. Syndicate Bank
Jind Branch Shop No.1, Near Bal Bhawan Rani Ka
Talab, Gohana Road, Jind Dist. : Jind
State: Haryana Pin: 126 102
255. Syndicate Bank
Khanna Branch,
G.T. Road Main Market, K.K. Towers Khanna,
Distt : Ludhiana State : Punjab Pin : 141 401
256. Syndicate Bank
Ludhiana Millerganj Branch,
B-VI-718, Gill Road Millerganj Ludhiana,
Dist.: Ludhiana State: Punjab Pin: 141 003
257. Syndicate Bank
Nawanshahr Branch B-1/171,
Banga Road, Nawanshahr Dist. : Nawanshahr,
State : Punjab Pin : 144514
258. Syndicate Bank
Rupnagar Branch No. 3039/2, Bela Chowk
Rupnagar Dist. : Rupnagar State : Punjab
Pin: 140 001

259. Syndicate Bank
KARNAL SADBHAVANA CHOWK BRANCH,
R. S. Public SR. SEC. School, Meera
Sadbhavana Chowk, Karnal Dist.: Karnal, State :
Haryana Pin : 132 001
260. Syndicate Bank
KARNAL RAILWAY ROAD BRANCH,
SD Model School Railway Road, Karnal,
Distt. Karnal, State : Haryana Pin: 132001
261. Syndicate Bank
KURUKSHETRA GREEN FIELD BRANCH,
Green Field Public School Pipli Road,
Kurukshetra, Distt. : Kurukshetra
State: Haryana Pin : 136118
262. Syndicate Bank
KURUKSHETRA SUNDERPUR BRANCH,
S. D. Girls Sr.Sec. School Bypass Road,
Sunderpur Kurukshetra Distt : Kurukshetra,
State: Haryana Pin : 136118
263. Syndicate Bank
PALAMPUR BRANCH No.715 Jamwal Bhawan
Opp. Head Post Office Palampur Distt: Kangra
State : Himachal Pradesh Pin: 176 061
264. Syndicate Bank
PANCHKULA BRANCH,
S.C.O.F-123 Mansi Devi Complex Sector-5,
Swastik Vihar, Panchkula District : Panchkula
State: Haryana Pin: 134114
265. Syndicate Bank
SOLAN BRANCH,
61/9, Bhardwaj Premises Rajgarh Road Solan,
Distt. Solan State: Himachal Pradesh
Pin - 173 212
266. Syndicate Bank
APRA BRANCH,
Kalsi Bhavan Banga Road Apra Tq. : Pillaur,
Distt. : Jalandhar State: Punjab Pin - 144 416
261. Syndicate Bank
DANAPUR NIYAMAT, BRANCH,
Rajpati Complex, First Floor,
Opposite Municipality Office P.O. Digha,
Danapur Dist.: Patna State: Bihar
Pin : 800012
268. Syndicate Bank
PATNA KIDWAIPURI BRANCH,
14, Aniket, I.A.S. Colony,
S. K. Nagar Kidwaipuri, Patna Dist : Patna
State:Bihar Pin: 800 001
269. Syndicate Bank
DANAPUR CANTONMENT BRANCH,
Cantonment Board, Chavani Sadan, Sadar Bazar,
Danapur Dist. Patna State: Bihar Pin: 801 503
270. Syndicate Bank
PATNA BAILEY ROAD BRANCH,
Gyan Niketan Building Ranjan Path,
West of Bailey Road, Dist.: Patna State : Bihar
Pin: 801 503
271. Syndicate Bank
PATNA SAIDPUR BRANCH,
Bihar Rajya Jal Parishad Building Saidpur Road,
Patna Dist: Patna State: Bihar
272. Syndicate Bank
DHANBAD BART AND BRANCH,
NIIT Campus Sural Complex,
Bartand Housing Colony Dhanbad
Dist : Dhanbad State: Jharkhand Pin: 826 001
273. Syndicate Bank
BHAGALPUR BRANCH,
Patal Babu Niwas, Patal Babu Road, Bhagalpur,
Dist. : Bhagalpur State : Bihar Pin : 812001
274. Syndicate Bank
CHAS BRANCH
Golden Palace Bye Pass Road Chas
Dist.: Bokaro State: Jharkhand Pin: 827 013
275. Syndicate Bank
DARBHANGAGYAN BHARATHI PUBLIC
SCHOOL BRANCH,
Laxmi Sagar Darbhanga Dist.: Darbhanga,
State: Bihar Pin : 846 004
276. Syndicate Bank
BOKARO STEEL CITY BRANCH,
C-1 City Centre, Sector IV Bokaro Steel City
Dist.: Bokaro State: Jharkhand Pin: 827 004
277. Syndicate Bank
HAZARIBAGH BRANCH,
Guru Gobind Singh Road Hazaribagh
Dist. : Hazaribagh State: Jharkhand Pin: 823 301
278. Syndicate Bank
RANCHI LADY KC ROY MEMSCHOOL BRANCH,
Surya Clinic Building Kumhar Toli Road No.2,
Kanta Toli, Ranchi Dist: Ranchi State: Jharkhand
Pin : 834 001
279. Syndicate Bank
RAMGARH BRANCH,
D. S. Complex, Main Road, Ramgarh Cantonment,
Dist : Hazaribagh State: Jharkhand Pin : 829 122
280. Syndicate Bank
MUNGER BRANCH Deepak Smriti Bhawan
Gulzar Pokhar Munger Dist.: Munger State: Bihar
Pin: 811 201
281. Syndicate Bank
MUZAFFARPUR BRANCH,
23, Chhoti Kalyani Road Near Kalyani Post Office,
Muzaffarpur Dist: Muzaffarpur, State: Bihar
Pin: 842 001

282. Syndicate Bank
PAKUR BRANCH,
Anand Restaurant First Floor,
Opposite Town Hall Haridanga Bazar
Main Road, Pakur Dist.: Pakur
State: Jharkhand Pin: 816 107
283. Syndicate Bank
MUZAFFARPUR TIRHUT CANAL DIVISION
BRANCH, Ramadayalu Nagar Muzaffarpur,
Dist: Muzaffarpur State: Bihar Pin: 842 002
284. Syndicate Bank
SIWAN BRANCH,
Moti Market, Babunia More Siwan
Dist.: Siwan State: Bihar Pin: 841 226.
285. Syndicate Bank
RANCHI KUTCHERY ROAD BRANCH,
Ranchi Regional Development Authority
Building Ranchi Dist.: Ranchi
State: Jharkhand Pin: 834 001
286. Syndicate Bank
PUSAJARI CAMPUS BRANCH,
Indian Agriculture Research Institute,
Block & PS Pusa Dist.: Samastipur,
State: Bihar Pin: 848 125
287. Syndicate Bank
SITAMARHI BRANCH, Krishna Market,
Dumra Road Sitamarhi Dist: Sitamarhi
State: Bihar Pin: 843 302
288. Syndicate Bank
CHHAPRA BRANCH,
B. P. Medicine Complex Srinandan Road,
Municipal Chowk Chhapra Dist.: Saran,
State: Bihar Pin: 841 301
289. Syndicate Bank
JAMSHEDPUR RAJENDRA VIDYALA BRANCH
Swaran Rekha, Link Road, Sakchi Jamshedpur
Dist.: Purbi Singhbhum State: Jharkhand
Pin: 831 001
290. Syndicate Bank
DEOGHAR BRANCH,
94, Assam Access Road Hotel Prabha Complex,
Deoghar, Distt: Deoghar State: Jharkhand
Pin: 814 112
291. Syndicate Bank
NARAYANPUR BRANCH,
PO. Dawath Via-Bikramganj Dist.: Rohtas,
State: Bihar, Pin: 802 226
292. Syndicate Bank
HAZIPUR BRANCH,
Rajpatikunwar Shopping Centre,
Dak Bungalow Road, Hazipur Distt.: Vaishali
State: Bihar Pin: 844 101
293. Syndicate Bank
GHORPARAS BRANCH,
Post - Sarwan Ghorparas Distt: Deoghar
State: Jharkhand Pin: 814 150
294. Syndicate Bank
SABAIJORE BRANCH,
AT /PO-Sabajore Via - Sarath Distt: Deoghar
State: Jharkhand Pin: 814 149
295. Syndicate Bank
MINI SECRETARIAT BRANCH,
Sector 12 Faridabad Dist.: Faridabad
State: Haryana Pin: 121 007
296. Syndicate Bank
SECTOR 21 C BRANCH,
SCO 138, Sector 21 C Faridabad Dist.:
Faridabad State: Haryana Pin: 121 001
297. Syndicate Bank
MUNICIPAL CORPORATION BRANCH,
Municipal Corporation Faridabad,
Complex M. C.F. Road, B.K. Chowk Faridabad,
Dist.: Faridabad State: Haryana Pin: 121 001
298. Syndicate Bank
SME BRANCH,
1, F-20 New Industrial Town, Faridabad
Dist.: Faridabad State: Haryana Pin: 121 005
299. Syndicate Bank
DLF GURGAON BRANCH,
No. A.209, Super Market No, 1 DLF Phase 4,
Gurgaon Dist.: Gurgaon State: Haryana,
Pin: 122 009
300. Syndicate Bank
ITM GURGAON BRANCH,
INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY & MANAGE-
MENT CAMPUS,
Palam Vihar, Sector 23A Gurgaon Dist.: Gurgaon
State: Haryana Pin: 122017
301. Syndicate Bank
AIR FORCE STATION BRANCH,
T-51 Sohna Road Air Force Station,
Campus, Gurgaon Dist.: Gurgaon,
State: Haryana Pin: 121 001
302. Syndicate Bank :
SME BRANCH,
Mehrauli Road, Sector 17, Sukhrali Gurgaon
Dist.: Gurgaon State: Haryana Pin: 121 001
303. Syndicate Bank
MN HOSPITAL RESEARCH CENTRE BRANCH,
Near Dr. Karni Singh Stadium Bikaner
Dist.: Bikaner State: Rajasthan Pin: 334001
304. Syndicate Bank
ALWAR DAYANAND MARG BHS SAMITI
BRANCH, Bala Hit Shiksha Samiti Bldg.,
Swamy Dayanand Marg, Alwar Dist.: Alwar,
State: Rajasthan Pin: 301 001

305. **Syndicate Bank**
MALVIYA NAGAR BRANCH,
G. 139, Malviya Nagar Industrial Area Jaipur,
Dist.: Jaipur State: Rajasthan Pin: 302 017
306. **Syndicate Bank**
JODHPUR PAL ROAD LIC CA BRANCH Pal
Road, Shastri Nagar Jodhpur Dist.: Jodhpur State:
Rajasthan Pin: 342 001
307. **Syndicate Bank**
SRI GANGANAGAR BRANCH,
7-B, Ravinderpath Sri Ganganagar
Dist.: Ganganagar State: Rajasthan Pin: 335 001
308. **Syndicate Bank**
LEAD DISTRICT OFFICE, NUH (MEWAT)
General Hospital Road Nuh Dist: Mewat State:
Haryana Pin: 121, 007
309. **Syndicate Bank**
NALLASOPARA BRANCH,
Shop No. 1 to 06 Bharat Vaibhav Building, Achole
Road Nallasopara (East) Vasai Taluk
Dist: Thane State: Maharashtra Pin: 401 209
310. **Syndicate Bank**
PURIGRAND ROAD BRANCH,
Market Square Puri Dist : Puri
State : Orissa Pin : 752 001

UNITED BANK OF INDIA

311. **United Bank of India**
Bangawan Branch P.O. Bangawan via Norhaiya,
Dist. Madhubani, Bihar-847 226
312. **United Bank of India**
Bar Council Br. Bihar State, Bar Council High
Court Compound, Patna-800 001
313. **United Bank of India**
Basantapur Patti Br. Block-Saraiya, PO-
Basantapur Patti via Bakhra, Dist.-Muzaffarpur
(Bihar)
314. **United Bank of India**
Belsandi Tara Br. PO-Belsandi Tara, via
Singhiaghat Dist.-Samastipur-848 212
315. **United Bank of India**
Chacharaha Br. P.O.-Chacharaha via Jainagar,
Block-Basopathi, Dist. Madhubani-847 226
316. **United Bank of India**
Dharhara Br. G. L. M. College Road, PO-
Banmankhi Purnea-854 202
317. **United Bank of India**
Machhipur Br. Vill & PO-Machhipur via Sabour,
Dist-Bhagalpur-813 210
318. **United Bank of India**
Mahaddipur Br. Block-Chatapur, PO-Pariyati via
Surpatganj, Dist.Sahasra-852 137

319. **United Bank of India**
Narghoghi Br. P.O.-Sarai Ranjan, Khauri Road
Dist.-Samastipur-848 111
320. **United Bank of India**
Naur Br. Block-Nabinagar, P.O.-Naur, Dist-
Aurangabad-824 303
321. **United Bank of India**
Nawabganj Br. P.O.-Nawabganj, Block-Manihari
Dist.-Katihar, Bihar.
322. **United Bank of India**
Pataliputra Colony 216, Pataliputra Colony,
Patna-800 013
323. **United Bank of India**
Rupauli Br. Vill-Rupauli, P.O.-Rajokhar via
Araria, Dist.-Araria, Bihar.
324. **United Bank of India**
Usrishikarpur Br. New Tarachak, P.O.-Danapur
Cantt. Dist-Patna-801 503

PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK

325. **Punjab National Bank**
Zonal Office 6-1-73, Saeed Plaza Lakdi ka Pul,
Hyderabad-500 004
326. **Punjab National Bank**
Mid Corporate Branch Road No. 12, Banjara
Hills, Hyderabad-500 034
327. **Punjab National Bank**
4/1/427, Troop Bazar Bank Street,
Hyderabad-500 001
328. **Punjab National Bank**
Deccan Chambers, Opp. Allwyn Bhawan
Erragadda Sanatnagar, Hyderabad-500 018
329. **Punjab National Bank**
Rashtrapathi Road Secunderabad-500 003
330. **Punjab National Bank**
LIC Building, Jeevan Prakash Road,
Visakhapatnam-530 002
331. **Punjab National Bank**
Mahatma Gandhi Road, Secunderabad-500 003
332. **Punjab National Bank**
1-8-59, Green Gate Chikkadapally,
Hyderabad-500 020
333. **Punjab National Bank**
Plot No. 3&4 Saibaba Mansion Vikrampur,
Habsiguda Hyderabad-500 007
334. **Punjab National Bank**
Q 4, A3, 1st Floor, Cyber Towers Hitec City,
Madhapur Hyderabad-500 081
335. **Punjab National Bank**
Sarvar Complex Phisal Banda Main Road
Kanchanbagh, Hyderabad-500 059

336. Punjab National Bank
16-1-545/5, Santoshnagar, Hyderabad
337. Punjab National Bank
6-1-73, Saeed Plaza Lakdi ka Pul, Saifabad
Hyderabad-500 004
338. Punjab National Bank
6-3-682/A, Thakur Mansion Somajiguda,
Hyderabad-500 082
339. Punjab National Bank
4, Srinagar Colony Lalbazar,
Secunderabad-500 015
340. Punjab National Bank
Manovikas Nagar NIMH, Bowenpally,
Secunderabad
341. Punjab National Bank
Shashtri Road, Karimnagar-505 001
342. Punjab National Bank
40/29, Park Road, Kurnool-518 001
343. Punjab National Bank
5-5-126/2, Khaleelwadi, Nizamabad-503 003
344. Punjab National Bank
Opp. Ailwyan Watch Division Patancheru,
Medak Dist.-502 319
345. Punjab National Bank
142, Amaravathi Hotel, Town Planning Area,
Tirupathi-517 501
346. Punjab National Bank
BO: Bheemaram Hanamkonda Block, Warangal
Dist-506 015
347. Punjab National Bank
Nandigaon Branch, Shadnagar Taluq,
Mahaboobnagar Dist-509 223
348. Punjab National Bank
Regional Processing Centre,
Netaji Bhawan, Himaynagar,
Hyderabad-500 029
349. Punjab National Bank
BO: Captainganj, Captainganj Main Market,
PO: Captainganj Tehsil: Hata, Distt: Kushi
Nagar, (UP) Pin Code: 274 301
350. Punjab National Bank
BO: Gola Bazar, Main Road Gola Bazar,
PO: Gola Bazar, Tehsil: Gola
Distt: Gorakhpur (UP)
Pin Code : 274 308
351. Punjab National Bank
BO: Salempur Near Thana Kotwali,
PO: Salempur, Tehsil: Salempur,
Distt: Deorai (UP) Pin Code : 274 509

352. Punjab National Bank
BO. Jal Sansthan Add: 111/8, Kanpur
Jalsansthan Benajhabar, Kanpur-208 002
353. Punjab National Bank
Kannauj Add: Ashok Nagar, Sarai
Meera, Distract Kannauj-209 725
354. Punjab National Bank
BO. Dibiyapur, Add: VGUD College Bela Road,
Dibiyapur, District Auraiya-206 244
355. Punjab National Bank
BO. Hamirpur Add: Jail Talab Road,
PO : Hamirpur, District Hamirpur
356. Punjab National Bank
BO Barra-8 Add: KDMA Parisar Barra-8,
Kanpur-208 027
357. Punjab National Bank
BO : Ait Add: Krishi Upaj Mandi Sthar Block
Dacour District, Jalaun
358. Punjab National Bank
Branch/Office: M. E. C. L
C. G. O. Complex, Seminary Hills, Nagpur.
Tehsil: Nagpur, District: Nagpur,
(Maharashtra)

INDIAN BANK

359. Indian Bank
Yuvraj Complex D.S 21, Lohiya Nagar
Kankadbagh, Patna-800 020
360. Indian Bank
Jage Shati Complex, Netaji Road,
Devghar-814 112

STATE BANK OF PATIALA

361. State Bank of Patiala
Civil Lines, Bathinda (Punjab)-151 005
362. State Bank of Patiala
PO : Kikkar Bazar, Bathinda (Punjab)-151 005
363. State Bank of Patiala
Maur Tehsil Talwandi Sabo, Distt Bathinda
(Punjab)-151 509
364. State Bank of Patiala
Mehna Sarja Teh & Distt. Bathinda
(Punjab)-151 509
365. State Bank of Patiala
Mehraj Tehsil Rampura Phul, Distt. Bathinda
(Punjab)-151 105
366. State Bank of Patiala
Balanwali Teh Rampura Phul, Distt. Bathinda
(Punjab)-151 107
367. State Bank of Patiala
Goniana Teh & Distt. Bhatinda (Punjab)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 368. State Bank of Patiala
Kot Fatta VPO Kot Fatta Tehsil & Distt.
Bhathinda (Punjab) | 385. State Bank of Patiala
Bhuchho Mandi Teh. & Distt. Bhathinda
(Punjab)-151 101 |
| 369. State Bank of Patiala
Phul Town, Tehsil Rampura Phul, Distt.
Bhathinda (Punjab) | 386. State Bank of Patiala
Grain Market, Bhathinda (Punjab)-151 001 |
| 370. State Bank of Patiala
Raman Mandi, Distt. Bhathinda (Punjab) | 387. State Bank of Patiala
Sheikhpura, VPO Sheikhpura Distt. Bhathinda
(Punjab) |
| 371. State Bank of Patiala
Talwandi Sabo Teh Talwandi Sabo, Distt.
Bhathinda (Punjab) | 388. State Bank of Patiala
Bhathinda Air Force Station Teh. &
Distt. Bhathinda (Punjab)-151 201 |
| 372. State Bank of Patiala
Rampura Phul Railway Road, Distt. Bhathinda
(Punjab) | 389. State Bank of Patiala
Kalyan Sukha, Teh. Nathana, Distt. Bhathinda
(Punjab) |
| 373. State Bank of Patiala
Industrial Area, Bhathinda (Punjab)-151 001 | 390. State Bank of Patiala
Nathana, Teh. & Distt. Bhathinda (Punjab)-
151 102 |
| 374. State Bank of Patiala
Guru Nanak Thermal Plant, Bhathinda
(Punjab)-151 002 | 391. State Bank of Patiala
Bangi Ruldu, Teh. Talwandi Sabo, Distt.
Bhathinda (Punjab) |
| 375. State Bank of Patiala
Bucho Kalan Tehsil & Distt. Bhathinda
(Punjab)-151 101 | 392. State Bank of Patiala
Paras Ram Nagar, Bhathinda (Punjab)-151 001 |
| 376. State Bank of Patiala
Bhatinda MSC Municipal Shopping Complex,
Bhathinda (Punjab)-151 001 | 393. State Bank of Patiala
Bhathinda Service Branch, The Mall, Bhathinda
(Punjab)-151 001 |
| 377. State Bank of Patiala
Virk Kalan PO Goniana, Distt. Bhathinda
(Punjab)-151 201 | 394. State Bank of Patiala
Bhathinda Cantt, Bhathinda (Punjab)-151 001 |
| 378. State Bank of Patiala
Bibiwala VPO Bibiwala, Distt. Bhathinda
(Punjab)-151 102 | 395. State Bank of Patiala
Mall Road, Bhathinda (Punjab)-151 001 |
| 379. State Bank of Patiala
Chauke PO Joga Via Mansa, Distt. Bhathinda
(Punjab) | 396. State Bank of Patiala
Bhagta Bhai Ka Distt. Bhathinda (Punjab) |
| 380. State Bank of Patiala
Myser Khana Teh. Talwandi Sabo,
Distt. Bhathinda (Punjab) | 397. State Bank of Patiala
Bhathinda (DAC) Distt. Admn. Complex,
Bhathinda (Punjab)-151 005 |
| 381. State Bank of Patiala
Tugwali Tehsil & Distt. Bhathinda
(Punjab)-151 101 | 398. State Bank of Patiala
Railway Road, Kotkapura, Distt. Faridkot
(Punjab) |
| 382. State Bank of Patiala
Balluana VPO Balluana, Giddrbaha Road,
Bhathinda (Punjab)-151 001 | 399. State Bank of Patiala
Jaitu, Boha Nandi Bazar, Distt. Faridkot
(Punjab)-151 102 |
| 383. State Bank of Patiala
Singho VPO Singho The Talwandi Sabo Distt.
Bhathinda (Punjab) | 400. State Bank of Patiala
Faridkot (Main) The Mall, Faridkot
(Punjab)-151 203 |
| 384. State Bank of Patiala
Jalal Tehsil, Phul Distt. Bhathinda
(Punjab)-151 101 | 401. State Bank of Patiala
Sadiq Teh. & Distt. Faridkot (Punjab)-151 203 |
| | 402. State Bank of Patiala
Panj Garain Kalan Teh. & Distt. Faridkot
(Punjab)-151 207 |

- | | |
|---|--|
| 403. State Bank of Patiala
Bargari, Teh. & Distt. Faridkot (Punjab)-151 207 | 421. State Bank of Patiala
Baghapurana (Nihal Singh Wala Road) Distt.
Moga (Punjab) |
| 404. State Bank of Patiala
Dhilwan Kalan, Teh. & Distt. Faridkot
(Punjab)-151 204 | 422. State Bank of Patiala
Civil Lines, GT Road, Moga (Punjab) |
| 405. State Bank of Patiala
Wander Jatana, Teh. & Distt. Faridkot (Punjab) | 423. State Bank of Patiala
Moga (Municipal Committee) Distt. Moga
(Punjab)-142 001 |
| 406. State Bank of Patiala
KNJ School, Faridkot, Distt. Faridkot (Punjab) | 424. State Bank of Patiala
Badhni Kalan, Teh. Nihal Singh Wala Distt.
Moga (Punjab) |
| 407. State Bank of Patiala
Kotkapura (Moga Road) Faridkot (Punjab) | 425. State Bank of Patiala
Mansa Main Opp, Civil Hospital,
Distt. Mansa (Punjab)-151 505 |
| 408. State Bank of Patiala
Zira (New Courts) Teh. & Distt. Faridkot
(Punjab)-142 047 | 426. State Bank of Patiala
Mansa Indl. Area, Distt. Mansa
(Punjab)-151 505 |
| 409. State Bank of Patiala
Ferozepur, The Mall, Ferozepur (Punjab) | 427. State Bank of Patiala
Boha, VPO Boha Distt. Mansa
(Punjab)-151 503 |
| 410. State Bank of Patiala
Abohar, Teh. & Distt. Ferozepur
(Punjab)-152 116 | 428. State Bank of Patiala
Bareta (Grain Market) Distt. Mansa (Punjab) |
| 411. State Bank of Patiala
Fazilika, Gaushala Road,
Teh. & Distt. Ferozepur
(Punjab)-152 123 | 429. State Bank of Patiala
Budhlada (Grain Market) Distt. Mansa
(Punjab)-151 502 |
| 412. State Bank of Patiala
Mundi Chhuri Maran At Makhu, Tehsil Zira,
Distt. Muketsar (Punjab)-142 051 | 430. State Bank of Patiala
Jhunir Distt. Mansa (Punjab)-151 506 |
| 413. State Bank of Patiala
Ferozepur Cantt Distt. Ferozepur (Punjab) | 431. State Bank of Patiala
Mansa ADB Distt. Mansa (Punjab)-151 505 |
| 414. State Bank of Patiala
Jalalabad West Bimal Place, Near Old Bus
Stand, Distt. Ferozepur (Punjab) | 432. State Bank of Patiala
Fatta Maluka Distt. Mansa (Punjab) |
| 415. State Bank of Patiala
Guru Har Sahai Old Mandi, Distt. Ferozepur
(Punjab) | 433. State Bank of Patiala
Behniwal, VPO Behniwal Distt. Mansa (Punjab) |
| 416. State Bank of Patiala
Talwandi Bhai Gali No. 5 Nai Abadi, Near Grain
Market, Bhatinda (Punjab) | 434. State Bank of Patiala
Sardulgarh, Teh. & Distt. Mansa
(Punjab)-151 507 |
| 417. State Bank of Patiala
Nihal Singh Wala, Teh. & Distt. Moga
(Punjab)-142 055 | 435. State Bank of Patiala
Khiala Kalan VPO Khiala Kalan Distt. Mansa
(Punjab) |
| 418. State Bank of Patiala
Dharamkot, Teh. & Distt. Moga (Punjab) | 436. State Bank of Patiala
Bhikhi Distt. Mansa (Punjab)-151 504 |
| 419. State Bank of Patiala
Karyal Distt. Moga (Punjab)-142 042 | 437. State Bank of Patiala
Bareh, VPO Bareh, Distt. Mansa |
| 420. State Bank of Patiala
Jalalabad East, Teh. Zira Distt. Moga
(Punjab)-142 058 | 438. State Bank of Patiala
Ralla, Distt. Mansa (Punjab) |
| | 439. State Bank of Patiala
Kot Bhai, Distt. Muketsar (Punjab) |

440. State Bank of Patiala
Gidderbaha Teh Gidderbaha Distt. Muketsar
(Punjab)-152 001
441. State Bank of Patiala
Malout Gidderbaha Road, Teh & Distt.
Muketsar (Punjab)
442. State Bank of Patiala
Muketsar Distt. Faridkot (Punjab)
443. State Bank of Patiala
Killanwali PO Mandi Dabwali Teh & Distt.
Muketsar (Punjab)
444. State Bank of Patiala
Bhalaiana VPO Bhalaiana Teh & Distt.
Muketsar (Punjab)
445. State Bank of Patiala
Alamwala Teh & Distt. Faridkot (Punjab)
446. State Bank of Patiala
Gurusar Mandir (Gidderbaha) P O Gurusar
Mandir Teh & Distt. Muketsar (Punjab)
447. State Bank of Patiala
Gidderbaha Gur Mandi Teh Gidderbaha Distt.
Muketsar (Punjab)

UNITED INDIA INSURANCE CO. LTD.

448. United India Insurance Co. Ltd.
Branch Office, 1st Floor, Police Gurudwara
Building, Post Box No. 30, Aberdeen Bazar, Port
Blair.
449. United India Insurance Co. Ltd.
Branch Office, 13 Maheswari Road,
Badwah-451 115
450. United India Insurance Co. Ltd.
Branch Office, Krishna Mandir, Phalke Bazar
Gwalior.
451. United India Insurance Co. Ltd.
Division Office, Semaria Chowk Rewa Road,
Satna-485 001(MP)
452. United India Insurance Co. Ltd.
Division Office Serial No. 4, 8/3, YN Road, Gau
Lok Building, first Floor, Indore (MP)

नई दिल्ली, 25 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 416.—भारतीय स्टेट बैंक अधिनियम, 1955 (1955 का 23) की धारा 19 के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के परामर्श से, एतद्द्वारा, डॉ. (श्रीमती) वसन्ता भारुचा को अधिसूचना की तिथि से तीन वर्षों की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के केन्द्रीय निदेशक मण्डल में, श्री पीयूष गोयल के स्थान पर अंशकालीन गैर-सरकारी निदेशक के रूप में नामित करती है।

[फा. सं. 8/2/2004-बीओ-1]

जी. बी. सिंह, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th February, 2008

S.O. 416.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of Section 19 of the State Bank of India Act, 1955 (23 of 1955), the Central Government, in consultation with the Reserve Bank of India hereby nominates Dr. (Mrs.) Vasantha Bharucha as part-time non-official Director on the Central Board of Directors of State Bank of India for a period of three years from the date of notification or until further orders, whichever is earlier, vice Shri Piyush Goel.

[F. No. 8/2/2004-BO-I]

G.B. SINGH, Dy. Secy.

वाणिज्य एवं उद्योग मंत्रालय**(वाणिज्य विभाग)**

नई दिल्ली, 14 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 417.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 12 के उप-नियम (2) के साथ पठित निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैसर्स सुपरिंटेंडेंस कंपनी आफ इंडिया (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, पी. ओ. नालदा, जिला कर्णोल, उडीसा-758042 को इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए तत्कालीन वाणिज्य मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का. आ. 3975 तारीख 20 दिसम्बर, 1965 में उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट खनिज और अयस्क ग्रुप-I अर्थात् लौह अयस्क और मैंगनीज अयस्क, (मैंगनीज डाइआक्साइड को छोड़कर) उक्त खनिजों और अयस्क के निर्यात से पूर्व निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन नालदा में, निरीक्षण करने के लिए एक अभिकरण के रूप में मान्यता प्रदान करती है, अर्थात् :-

(i) यह कि मैसर्स सुपरिंटेंडेंस कंपनी आफ इंडिया (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, नालदा खनिज और अयस्क ग्रुप-I (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1965 के नियम 4 के अधीन निरीक्षण का प्रमाण पत्र देने के लिए उनके द्वारा अपनाई गई पद्धति की जांच करने के लिए, इस निमित्त निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद द्वारा नामित अधिकारियों को पर्याप्त सुविधाएं देगी;

(ii) यह कि मैसर्स सुपरिंटेंडेंस कंपनी आफ इंडिया (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, नालदा इस अधिसूचना के अधीन अपने कृत्यों के पालन में निदेशक (निरीक्षण और क्वालिटी नियंत्रण) द्वारा समय-समय पर लिखित में दिए गए निर्देशों से आबद्ध होगी।

[फा. सं. 5/13/2007/ ईआई एण्ड ईपी]

इन्दिरा मूर्ति, उप सचिव

**MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND
INDUSTRY****(Department of Commerce)**

New Delhi, the 14th February, 2008

S.O. 417.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the Export (Quality Con-

trol and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), read with sub-rule (2) of rule 12 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Rule 1964, the Central Government hereby recognises M/s. Superintendence Co. of India Pvt. Ltd., P.O. Nalda, Dist. Keonjhar, Orissa-758042, as an agency for a period of three years with effect from the date of publication of this notification, for inspection of Minerals and Ores (Group-I), namely, Iron Ore and Manganese Ore (excluding Manganese Dioxide) as specified in the Schedule

annexed to the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce number S.O. 3975 dated the 20th December, 1965, prior to the export of the said Minerals and Ores at Nalda, subject to the following conditions, namely:-

(i) that M/s. Superintendence Co. of India Private Ltd., Nalda shall give adequate facilities to the officers nominated by the Export Inspection Council in this behalf to examine the method of inspection followed by them in granting the certificate of inspection under rule 4 of the Export of Minerals and Ores Group-I (Inspection) Rules, 1965;

(ii) that M/s. Superintendence Co. of India Private Ltd., Nalda in the performance of their function under this notification shall be bound by such directives as the Director (Inspection and Quality Control), Export Inspection Council may give in writing from time to time.

[File No. 5/13/2007-EI & EP]

INDIRA MURTHY, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 418.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 12 के उप-नियम (2) के साथ पठित निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैसर्स इन्स्पेक्टोरेट ग्रिफ्थ इंडिया प्रा. लि., जोड़ा-बांसपानी रोड, कमरजोड़ा, जोड़ा-758 034 जिला क्योझार, उड़ीसा को भारत सरकार वाणिज्य मंत्रालय की इस अधिसूचना संख्यांक का.आ. 3975 दिनांक 20 दिसम्बर, 1965 और का.आ. 3978 तारीख 20 दिसम्बर, 1965 से उपाबद्ध अनुसूचियों में यथाविनिर्दिष्ट खनिजों और अयस्कों समूह-I अर्थात् लौह अयस्क और मैंगनीज अयस्क और समूह-II अर्थात् मैंगनीज डॉयआक्साइड का जोड़ा में उक्त खनिजों और अयस्कों का निर्यात करने से पूर्व निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए निरीक्षण करने के लिए इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अधिकरण के रूप में मान्यता देती है, अर्थात् :-

(i) मैसर्स इन्स्पेक्टोरेट ग्रिफ्थ इंडिया प्रा. लि., जोड़ा इस निमित्त निर्यात निरीक्षण काउंसिल द्वारा नाम निर्देशित अधिकारियों को उनके द्वारा अपनाई गई पद्धति की

जांच करने के लिए, खनिज और अयस्क समूह-I का निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1965 खनिज और अयस्क समूह-II का निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1965 के नियम 4 के अधीन निरीक्षण का प्रमाण पत्र देने के लिए उनके द्वारा असरित पद्धति की परीक्षा करने के लिए पर्याप्त सुविधाएं देगी ;

(ii) मैसर्स इन्स्पेक्टोरेट ग्रिफ्थ इंडिया प्रा. लि., जोड़ा इस अधिसूचना के अधीन अपने कृत्यों के अनुपालन में ऐसे निर्देशों से आबद्ध होगी जो निदेशक (निरीक्षण और क्वालिटी नियंत्रण) निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद द्वारा समय-समय पर लिखित रूप में दिए जाएं ।

[फा. सं. 5/14/2007/ ईआई एण्ड ईपी]

इन्दिरा मूर्ति, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2008

S.O. 418.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), read with sub-rule (2) of Rule 12 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Rule 1964, the Central Government hereby recognises M/s. Inspectorate Griffith India Pvt. Ltd., Jodha-Banspani Road, Kamarjoda, Joda-758034, Dist. Keonjhar, Orissa, as an agency for a period of three years with effect from the date of publication of this notification, for inspection of Minerals and Ores (Group-I), namely, Iron Ore and Manganese Ore, and (Group-II), namely, Manganese Dioxide, as specified in the Schedules annexed to the notifications of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce numbers S.O. 3975 dated the 20th December, 1965 and S.O. 3978 dated the 20th December, 1965, prior to the export of the said Minerals and Ores at Joda, subject to the following conditions, namely :—

(i) that M/s. Inspectorate Griffith India Pvt. Ltd., Joda shall give adequate facilities to the officers nominated by the Export Inspection Council in this behalf to examine the method of inspection followed by them in granting the certificate of inspection under rule 4 of the Export of Minerals and Ores, Group-I (Inspection) Rules, 1965 and the Export of Minerals and Ores, Group-II (Inspection) Rules, 1965;

(ii) that M/s. Inspectorate Griffith India Pvt. Ltd., Joda in the performance of their function under this notification shall be bound by such directives as the Director (Inspection and Quality Control), Export Inspection Council may give in writing from time to time.

[File No. 5/14/2007-EI & EP]

INDIRA MURTHY, Dy. Secy.

खान मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 419.—सार्वजनिक परिसर (अनधिकृत अधिभोगियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 की धारा 2 (ड) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केंद्र सरकार एतद्वारा संलग्न विवरणों (अनुबंध 1-3) में यथा विनिर्दिष्ट परिसरों को सार्वजनिक परिसरों के रूप में घोषित करती है।

[सं. 5(25)/2007-धातु-3]

प्रमोद चन्द, अवर सचिव

अनुबंध-I

कोलकाता में एच सी एल के स्वामित्व वाली सम्पत्ति का ब्यौरा

फ्लैट्स

अवस्थिति	फ्लैट्स सं.	वर्ग फीट क्षेत्र	खरीदने का वर्ष	खरीदने की लागत
गार्डन अपार्टमेंट 25 गरियाहट रोड (दक्षिण) कोलकाता-700 031	ए-4	1204.46	जून, 1982	45,02,756.70 रु.
	ए-5	1204.46	जून, 1982	
	बी-2	930.30	अप्रैल, 1982	
	बी-3	930.30	अप्रैल, 1982	
	सी-2	1295.86	जनवरी, 1982	
	सी-3	1295.86	जनवरी, 1982	
	सी-4	1295.29	अप्रैल, 1982	
	सी-5	1295.29	जून, 1982	
	जे-5	1453.65	सितम्बर, 1982	
	के-5	1605.97	अक्टूबर, 1982	
8 कारों के लिए पार्किंग स्थान			अक्टूबर, 1982	
अवस्थिति	फ्लैट्स सं.	वर्ग फीट क्षेत्र	खरीदने का वर्ष	खरीदने की लागत
आर्पी हाऊस 10 प्रियानाथ मुल्लिक रोड, कोलकाता-700 025	2 ई	1213.19	जून, 1984	27,32,346.95 रु.
	3 ई	1213.19	जून, 1984	
	4 ई	1213.19	जून, 1984	
	4 डी 1	1428.73	जून, 1984	
	4 कार पार्किंग का स्थान		जून, 1984	
अवस्थिति	फ्लैट्स सं.	वर्ग फीट क्षेत्र	खरीदने का वर्ष	खरीदने की लागत
प्रेसमैन अपार्टमेंट 111 एन एस सी बॉस 1 ई रोड, कोलकाता-700 040		1181.61	अक्टूबर, 1987	17,56,271.00 रु.
	3 ई	1158.69	अक्टूबर, 1987	
	4 ई	1158.69	अक्टूबर, 1987	
	5 ई	1158.69	अक्टूबर, 1987	
	4 कार पार्किंग का स्थान			

कार्यालय परिसर

अवस्थिति

ताम्र भवन

1 आशुतोष चौधरी

एवेन्यु कोलकाता-700 0019

कुल भूमि 1 बीघा 2 कट्टा 6 छिटाक (22.38 कोटा)

एसबीए (अधिकतम) 3840 वर्ग मी. (भूमि तल+ 3 ऊपरी तल)

बेसमेन्ट + भूमि तल + 3 ऊपरी तल

अनुबंध-II

नई दिल्ली में

क्रम सं.	अवस्थिति	क्षेत्र
1.	स्कोप मिनार, साउथ टावर, पाँचवाँ तल, दिल्ली-110 092	931 वर्ग मीटर

जयपुर में

क्रम सं.	अवस्थिति	क्षेत्र
1.	प्रोपर्टी सं. एनएसओ-1, नेहरू प्लेस कमर्शियल काम्प्लेक्स, टोंक रोड, जयपुर, राजस्थान	90.87 वर्ग मीटर

इंदौर में

क्रम सं.	अवस्थिति	क्षेत्र
1.	116/118, सनराइज टावर, 579, एम जी रोड, इंदौर-452 001	1000 वर्ग फीट के लगभग

अनुबंध-III

तलोजा कॉपर प्रोजेक्ट

क्रम सं.	प्रोपर्टी का विवरण	अवस्थिति	प्रत्येक इकाई का क्षेत्र (वर्ग मीटर)	इकाइयों की सं.
1	संयंत्र	प्लॉट सं. ई-33-36, एम आई डी सी क्षेत्र, पी ओ तालोजा 410 208 जिला रायगढ़, महाराष्ट्र	31675	1
2	इकाई प्रमुख का बंगला	सं. 3 व 4 गुलमोहर को ऑपरेटिव हाउसिंग सोसाइटी, सेक्टर-2 न्यू पनवेल, जिला रायगढ़, महाराष्ट्र	317.59	1
3	अधिकारियों के क्वार्टर्स	पी एल-6-7/9, 7/12.14/3, 15/10, 15/12.21/7 से 12 और 23/11-सेक्टर-17, नई पनवेल, जिला रायगढ़	58.50 (बना हुआ क्षेत्र)	12
4	कामगार क्वार्टर्स	सेक्टर-14, न्यू पनवेल, जिला रायगढ़ में ई-1/21-ए 1 से ए 4, बी 1 से बी 4 और सी 1 से सी 4 (भूतल)	21.79	12
		ए 5 से ए 8, बी 5 से बी 8 और सी 5 से सी 8 (प्रथम तल)	22.58	12
		ए 9 से ए 10, बी 9 से बी 10 और सी 9 से सी 10 (द्वितीय तल)	40.88	06
5	कामगार क्वार्टर्स	ए-201 और ए-202 आशीष को.ओ. हाउसिंग सोसाइटी, सेक्टर-2, न्यू पनवेल, जिला रायगढ़ में	565 (सुपर बिल्टअप क्षेत्र)	2

मुम्बई में

क्रम सं.	विवरण	खरीद तिथि	क्षेत्र
1	कार्यालय स्थान, 1104 एम्बेसी सेंटर, नरीमन प्वाइंट, मुम्बई-400 021	31-07-1991	580 वर्ग फीट
2	फ्लैट (4 फ्लैट)-202, 302, 303, 402 सुंदरम 3/ए राहेंजा कॉम्प्लेक्स मलाड (पूर्व) मुम्बई-400 097	28-05-1987	530 वर्ग फीट (प्रत्येक फ्लैट)
3	फ्लैट 404, शिवम 1/बी राहेंजा कॉम्प्लेक्स मलाड (पूर्व) मुम्बई-400 097	26-08-1993	845 वर्ग फीट

MINISTRY OF MINES

New Delhi, the 11th February, 2008

S.O. 419—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 2(e) of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised occupants) Act, 1971, the Central Government do hereby declares the premises as indicated in the annexed Statements (Annexures I to III) as Public Premises.

[No. 5(25)/2007-Met. III]

PRAMOD CHAND, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE-I

DETAILS OF PROPERTY OWNED BY HCL AT KOLKATA

FLATS

Location	Flat No.	Area Sft.	Year of Purchase	Purchase Value
Garden Apartment 25 Gariahat Road (South) Kolkata 700 031	A-4	1204.46	June 1982	Rs. 45,02,756.70
	A-5	1204.46	June 1982	
	B-2	930.30	April 1982	
	B-3	930.30	April 1982	
	C-2	1295.86	January 1982	
	C-3	1295.86	January 1982	
	C-4	1295.29	April 1982	
	C-5	1295.29	June 1982	
	J-5	1453.65	Sept. 1982	
	K-5	1605.97	Oct. 1982	
	8 Car Parking Spaces*		Oct. 1982	

Location	Flat No.	Area Sft.	Year of Purchase	Purchase Value
Arpee House 10 Priyanath Mullick Road Kolkata 700 025	2 E	1213.19	June 1984	Rs. 27,32,346.95
	3 E	1213.19	June 1984	
	4 E	1213.19	June 1984	
	4 DI	1428.73	June 1984	
	4 Car Parking Spaces		June 1984	

Location	Area Flat No.	Year of Sft.	Purchase	Purchase Value
Pressman Apartment 111 N S C Bose Road Kolkata 700 040	1E	1181.61	Oct. 1987	Rs. 17,56,271.00
	3 E	1158.69	Oct. 1987	
	4 E	1158.69	Oct. 1987	
	5 E	1158.69	Oct. 1987	
	4 Car Parking Spaces			

OFFICE PREMISES

Location

Tamra Bhavan	Total Land	1 Bigha 2 Cottah 6 Chittacks
1 Ashutosh Chowdhury Avenue		(22.38 cottahs)
Kolkata 700 019	SBA (approx.)	3840 SQ. M. (GF+3 upper floors)
		Basement + GF+3 upper floors

ANNEXURE-II

AT NEW DELHI

Sl. No.	Location	Area
1.	SCOPE Minar, South Tower, 5th Floor, Delhi-110092	931 Sq. Meters

AT JAIPUR

Sl. No.	Location	Area
1.	Property No. NSO-I, Nehru Place Commercial Complex Tonk Road, Jaipur, Rajasthan	90.87 Sq. Mtrs.

AT INDORE

Sl. No.	Location	Area
1.	116/118, Sunrise Tower 579, M G Road, Indore-452 001	Around 1000 Sq. ft.

ANNEXURE-III

TALOJA COPPER PROJECT

Sl. No.	Description of the property	Location	Area of each unit (Sqr. mtr.)	No. of units
1	Plant	Plot No. E-33-36, MIDC Area, P.O. Talaja-410208, Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra	31675	1
2	Unit Head's bungalow	No. 3 & 4, Gulmohar Co-op. Housing Society, Sector-2, New Panvel, Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra	317.59	1
3	Officers' quarters	PL-6-7/9, 7/12, 14/3, 15/10, 15/12, 21/7 TO 12 AND 23/11- Sector-17, New Panvel, Dist. Raigad	58.50 (built up area)	12
4	Workmen Quarters	E-1/21-A 1 to A 4, B1 to B4 and C1 to C4 (Gr. Fl.)	21.79	12
		A5 to A8, B5 to B8 and C5 to C8 (1st Fl.)	22.58	12
		A9 to A10, B9 to B10 and C9 to C10 (2nd Fl.) at Sector-14, New Panvel, Dist. Raigad	40.88	06
5	Workmen Quarters	A-201 and A-202 at Asish Co-op. Housing Society, Sector-2, New Panvel, Dist. Raigad	565 (super built up area)	2

AT MUMBAI

Sl. No.	Details	Pur. Date	Area
1	Office Accommodation 1104, Embassy Centre Nariman Point Mumbai-400 021	31-07-1991	580 Sq. ft.
2	Flats (4 Flats)-202, 302, 303, 402 Sundaram 3/A Raheja Complex Malad (East) Mumbai-400097	28-05-1987	530 Sq. ft. (Each Flat)
3	Flat 404, Shivam 1/B Raheja Complex, Malad (East) Mumbai-400097	26-08-1993	845 Sq. ft.

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 420.—सार्वजनिक परिसर (अनधिकृत अधिभोगियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजन के लिए, केन्द्र सरकार नीचे दी गई सारणी के कालम (1) में उल्लिखित अधिकारियों को जो सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी की श्रेणी के समकक्ष हैं, को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनार्थ सम्पदा अधिकारी हैं और इसके अलावा निर्देश देती है कि उक्त अधिकारी उक्त सारणी के कालम (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट सार्वजनिक परिसरों के संबंध में अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की स्थानीय सीमाओं के भीतर उक्त अधिनियम के अंतर्गत अथवा उसके द्वारा लगायी गई शक्तियों और शुल्कों का प्रयोग करेंगे।

सारणी

अधिकारी का पदनाम	सार्वजनिक परिसर की श्रेणियां और क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाएं
(1)	(2)
(क) कोलकाता में हिंदुस्तान कॉपर लिमिटेड के स्वामित्व वाली सम्पत्तियां प्रबंधक (प्रशासन) अथवा हिंदुस्तान कॉपर लि., कोलकाता का प्रशासनिक प्रधान	(जो अनुबंध-I में विहित है उसे यहां समाविष्ट किया जाए)
(ख) एच सी एल के दिल्ली, जयपुर और इन्दौर कार्यालय के लिए प्रबंधक (प्रशासन) अथवा हिंदुस्तान कॉपर लि., कोलकाता का प्रशासनिक प्रधान	(जो अनुबंध-II में विहित है उसे यहां समाविष्ट किया जाए)
(ग) तलोजा कापर परियोजना और मुम्बई कार्यालय के लिए तालोजा ताम्र परियोजना के मानव संसाधन विभाग के प्रमुख	(जो अनुबंध-III में विहित है उसे यहां समाविष्ट किया जाए)

[सं. 5 (25)/2007-धातु-III]

प्रमोद चंद, अवर सचिव

अनुबंध-I

कोलकाता में एच सी एल के स्वामित्व वाली सम्पत्ति का ब्यौरा

फ्लैट्स

अवस्थिति	फ्लैट्स सं.	वर्ग फीट क्षेत्र	खरीदने का वर्ष	खरीदने की लागत
गार्डन अपार्टमेन्ट 25 गरियाहट रोड(दक्षिण) कोलकाता-700 031	ए-4	1204.46	जून, 1982	45,02,756.70 रु.
	ए-5	1204.46	जून, 1982	
	बी-2	930.30	अप्रैल, 1982	
	बी-3	930.30	अप्रैल, 1982	
	सी-2	1295.86	जनवरी, 1982	
	सी-3	1295.86	जनवरी, 1982	
	सी-4	1295.29	अप्रैल, 1982	
	सी-5	1295.29	जून, 1982	
	जे-5	1453.65	सितम्बर, 1982	
	के-5	1605.97	अक्टूबर, 1982	
8 कारों के लिए पार्किंग स्थान			अक्टूबर, 1982	

अवस्थिति	प्लॉट्स सं.	वर्ग फीट क्षेत्र	खरीदने का वर्ष	खरीदने की लागत
आर्पी हाऊस 10 प्रियानाथ मोस्लिक रोड, कौलकाता-700 025	2 ई	1213.19	जून, 1984	27,32,346.95 रु.
	3 ई	1213.19	जून, 1984	
	4 ई	1213.19	जून, 1984	
	4 डी 1	1428.73	जून, 1984	
	4 कार पार्किंग का स्थान		जून, 1984	
प्रेसमैन अपार्टमेंट 111 एन एस बी बॉस 1 ई रोड, कौलकाता-700 040		1181.61	अक्टूबर, 1987	17,56,271.00 रु.
	3 ई	1158.69	अक्टूबर, 1987	
	4 ई	1158.69	अक्टूबर, 1987	
	5 ई	1158.69	अक्टूबर, 1987	
	4 कार पार्किंग का स्थान			

कार्यालय परिसर

अवस्थिति

ताम्र भवन

कुल भूमि 1 बीघा 2 कट्टा 6 छिटाक (22.38 कोटा)

1 आशुतोष चौधुरी

एसबीए (अधिकतम) 3840 वर्ग मी. (भूमि तल + 3 ऊपरी तल)

एवेन्यु कौलकाता-700019

बेसमेन्ट + भूमि तल + 3 ऊपरी तल

अनुबंध-II

नई दिल्ली में

क्रम सं.	अवस्थिति	क्षेत्र
1.	स्कोप मिनार, साउथ टावर, पांचवां तल, दिल्ली-110092	931 वर्ग मीटर

जयपुर में

क्रम सं.	अवस्थिति	क्षेत्र
1.	प्रोपर्टी सं. एनएसओ-1, नेहरू प्लेस कमर्शियल काम्पलेक्स, टोंक रोड, जयपुर, राजस्थान	90.87 वर्ग मीटर

इंदौर में

क्रम सं.	अवस्थिति	क्षेत्र
1.	116/118, सनराइज टावर, 579, एम जी रोड, इंदौर-452 001	1000 वर्ग फीट के लगभग

अनुबंध-III

तलोजा कॉपर प्रोजेक्ट

क्रम सं.	प्रोपर्टी का विवरण	अवस्थिति	प्रत्येक इकाई का क्षेत्र (वर्ग मीटर)	इकाइयों की सं.
1	2	3	4	5
1	संयंत्र	प्लॉट सं. ई-33-36, एम आई डी सी क्षेत्र, पी ओ तलोजा 410208 जिला रायगढ़, महाराष्ट्र	31675	1
2	इकाई प्रमुख का बंगला	सं. 3 व 4 गुलमोहर को ऑपरेटिव हाउसिंग सोसाइटी, सेक्टर-2 न्यू पनवेल, जिला-रायगढ़, महाराष्ट्र	317.59	1
3	अधिकारियों के क्वार्टर्स	पी एल-6-7 /9, 7/12. 14/3, 15/10, 15/12, 21/7 से 12 और 23/11-सेक्टर-17, नई पनवेल, जिला रायगढ़	58.50 (बना हुआ क्षेत्र)	12
4	कामगार क्वार्टर्स	सेक्टर-14, न्यू पनवेल, जिला रायगढ़ में ई-1/21-ए 1 से ए 4, बी 1 से बी 4 और सी 1 से सी 4 (भूतल)	21.79	12
		ए 5 से ए 8, बी 5 से बी 8 और सी 5 से सी 8 (प्रथम तल)	22.58	12
		ए 9 से ए 10, बी 9 से बी 10 और सी 9 से सी 10 (द्वितीय तल)	40.88	06
5	कामगार क्वार्टर्स	ए-201 और ए-202 आशीष को.ओ. हाउसिंग सोसाइटी, सेक्टर-2, न्यू पनवेल, जिला रायगढ़ में	565 (सुपर बिल्टअप क्षेत्र)	2

मुम्बई में

क्रम सं.	विवरण	खरीद तिथि	क्षेत्र
1	कार्यालय स्थान, 1104 एम्बेसी सेंटर, नरीमन प्वाइंट, मुम्बई-400 021	31-07-1991	580 वर्ग फीट
2	फ्लैट (4 फ्लैट)-202, 302, 303, 402 सुंदरम 3/ए राहेजा कॉम्प्लेक्स मलाड (पूर्व) मुम्बई-400097	28-05-1987	530 वर्ग फीट (प्रत्येक फ्लैट)
3	फ्लैट 404, शिवम 1/बी राहेजा कॉम्प्लेक्स मलाड (पूर्व) मुम्बई-400097	26-08-1993	845 वर्ग फीट

New Delhi, the 11th February, 2008

S.O. 420.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised occupants) Act, 1971, the Central Government do hereby appoints the officers mentioned in column (1) of the Table below being officers equivalent to the rank of Gazetted Officer of Government to be Estate Officers for the purpose of said Act, and further directs that the said officers shall exercise the powers and duties imposed by or under the said Act within the local limits of his jurisdictions in respect of the public premises specified in Column (2) of the said Table.

TABLE

Designation of the Officer	Categories of public/premises and local limits of jurisdiction
(1)	(2)
(A) For properties owned by Hindustan Copper Limited at Kolkata Manager (Admn.) or Head of Administration Deptt. of Hindustan Copper Limited, Kolkata	(Here incorporate what is contained in the Annexure-I)
(B) For HCL, Delhi, Jaipur and Indore office. Manager (Admn.) or Head of Administration Deptt. of Hindustan Copper Limited, Kolkata	(Here incorporate what is contained in the Annexure-II)

(1)	(2)
(C) For Talaja Copper Project and Mumbai Office. Head of Human Resource Department of Talaja Copper Project.	(Here incorporate what is contained in the Annexure-III)

[No. 5(25)/2007-Met. III.]

PRAMOD CHAND, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE-I**DETAILS OF PROPERTY OWNED BY HCL AT KOLKATA****FLATS**

Location	Flat No.	Area Sft.	Year of Purchase	Purchase Value
Garden Apartment 25 Gariahat Road (South) Kolkata-700 031	A-4	1204.46	June 1982	Rs. 45,02,756.70
	A-5	1204.46	June 1982	
	B-2	930.30	April 1982	
	B-3	930.30	April 1982	
	C-2	1295.86	January 1982	
	C-3	1295.86	January 1982	
	C-4	1295.29	April 1982	
	C-5	1295.29	June 1982	
	J-5	1453.65	Sept. 1982	
	K-5	1605.97	Oct. 1982	
	8 Car Parking Spaces		Oct. 1982	

Location	Flat No.	Area Sft.	Year of Purchase	Purchase Value
Arpee House 10 Priyanath Mullick Road Kolkata-700 025	2E	1213.19	June 1984	Rs. 27,32,346.95
	3E	1213.19	June 1984	
	4E	1213.19	June 1984	
	4D1	1428.73	June 1984	
	4 Car Parking Spaces		June 1984	

Location	Flat No.	Area Sft.	Year of Purchase	Purchase Value
Pressman Apartment	1E	1181.61	Oct. 1987	Rs. 17,56,271.00
	3E	1158.69	Oct. 1987	
	4E	1158.69	Oct. 1987	
	5E	1158.69	Oct. 1987	
	4 Car Parking Spaces			

OFFICE PREMISES**Location****Tamra Bhavan****Total Land**

1 Bigha 2 Cottah 6 Chittacks

1 Ashutosh Chowdhury Avenue

(22.38 cottahs)

Kolkata 700 019

SBA (approx.)

3840 SQ. M. (GF+3 upper floors)

Basement + GF+3 upper floors

ANNEXURE-II**AT NEW DELHI**

Sl. No.	Location	Area
1.	SCOPE Minar, South Tower, 5th Floor, Delhi-110 092	931 Sq. Meters

AT JAIPUR

Sl. No.	Location	Area
1.	Property No. NSO-I, Nehru Place Commercial Complex Tonk Road, Jaipur, Rajasthan	90.87 Sq. Mtrs.

AT INDORE

Sl. No.	Location	Area
1.	116/118, Sunrise Tower 579, M G Road, Indore-452 001	Around 1000 Sq. ft.

ANNEXURE-III**TALOJA COPPER PROJECT**

Sl. No.	Description of the property	Location	Area of each unit (Sqr. mtr.)	No. of units
1.	Plant	Plot No. E-33-36, MIDC Area, P.O. Talaja-410208, Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra	31675	1
2.	Unit Head's Bungalow	No. 3 & 4, Gulmohar Co-op. Housing Society, Sector-2, New Panvel, Dist. Raigad, Maharashtra	317.59	1
3.	Officers' Quarters	PL-6-7/9, 7/12, 14/3, 15/10, 15/12, 21/7 To 12 And 23/11-Sector-17, New Panvel, Dist. Raigad	58-50 (built up area)	
4.	Workmen Quarters	E-1/21-A1 to A4, B1 to B4 and C1 to C4 (Gr. Fl.)	21.79	12
		A5 to A8, B5 to B8 and C5 to C8 (1st Fl.)	22.58	12
		A9 to A10, B9 to B10 and C9 to C10 (2nd Fl.) at Sector-14, New Panvel, Dist. Raigad	40.88	06
5.	Workmen Quarters	A-201 and A-202 at Asish Co-op. Housing Society, Sector-2, New Panvel, Dist. Raigad	565 (super built up area)	2

At Mumbai

Sl. No.	Details	Pur. Date	Area
1.	Office Accommodation 1104, Embassy Centre Nariman Point-400 021	31-07-1991	580 Sq. ft.
2.	Flats (4 Flats)-202,302, 303, 402 Sundaram 3/A Raheja Complex, Malad (East) Mumbai-400097	28-05-1987	530 Sq. ft. (Each Flat)
3.	Flat 404, Shivam 1/B Raheja Complex, Malad (East) Mumbai-400097	26-08-1993	845 Sq. ft.


उपभोक्ता मामले, खाद्य और सार्वजनिक वितरण मंत्रालय

(उपभोक्ता मामले विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 421.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) तथा बाट और माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और उप-धारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स ऑरपैट आटोमेशन सिस्टम्स, नं. 25, प्रथम तल, एम ई आई लेआउट, हसाराघाट रोड, बेंगलूर-560 057 द्वारा विनिर्मित मध्यम यथार्थता (यथार्थता वर्ग III) वाले “ओ टी-II” श्रृंखला के अंकक सूचन सहित, अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (टेबलटाप प्रकार) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम “ऑरपैट” है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एम डी/09/07/296 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करती है ।



उक्त मॉडल एक विकृत गेज प्रकार का भार सेल आधारित अस्वचालित (टेबलटाप प्रकार) तोलन उपकरण है । इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 30 कि.ग्रा. और न्यूनतम क्षमता 100 ग्रा. है । सत्यापन मापमान अन्तराल (ई) 5 ग्रा. है । इसमें एक आधेयतुलन युक्ति है जिसका शत प्रतिशत व्यवकलनात्मक धारित आधेयतुलन प्रभाव है । प्रकाश उत्सर्जक डायोड (एल ई डी) प्रदर्श परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है । उपकरण 230 वोल्ट, 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत प्रदाय पर कार्य करता है।

स्टॉपिंग प्लेट के मुद्रांकन के अतिरिक्त मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोलने से रोकने के लिए सीलबन्द भी किया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पहले या बाद में उसकी सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम, निष्पादन सिद्धांत आदि की शर्तों पर परिवर्तित नहीं किया जाएगा ।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (12) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त मॉडल के अनुमोदन के इस प्रमाण-पत्र के अंतर्गत उसी विनिर्माता द्वारा उसी सिद्धांत, डिजाइन के अनुसार और उसी सामग्री से जिससे अनुमोदित मॉडल का विनिर्माण किया गया है, विनिर्मित उसी श्रृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो 100 मि. ग्रा. से 2 ग्रा. तक के “ई” मान के लिए 100 से 10,000 तक की रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) और 5 ग्रा. या उससे अधिक के “ई” मान के लिए 500 से 10,000 तक की रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) सहित 50 कि.ग्रा. तक की अधिकतम क्षमता वाले हैं और “ई” मान 1×10^{-3} , 2×10^{-3} या 5×10^{-3} , के हैं, जो धनात्मक या ऋणात्मक पूर्णांक या शून्य के समतुल्य हैं।

[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(154)/2007]


आर. माथुरबूथम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION**(Department of Consumer Affairs)****New Delhi, the 8th February, 2008**

S.O. 421.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of non-automatic (Table top type) weighing instrument with digital indication of "OT-II" series of medium accuracy (accuracy class-III) and with brand name "ORPAT" (herein referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. Orpat Automation Systems, No. 25, 1st Floor, M.E.I. Layout, Hesaraghatta Road, Bangalore—560 057 and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/07/296;

The said model is a strain gauge type load cell based non-automatic weighing instrument (Table top type) with a maximum capacity of 30 kg. and minimum capacity of 100 g. The verification scale interval (e) is 5 g. It has a tare device with 100 per cent subtractive retained tare effect. The Light Emitting Diode (LED) display indicates the weighing result. The instrument operates on 230 Volts and 50 Hertz alternate current power supply.



In addition to sealing the stamping plate sealing shall also be done to prevent the opening of the machine for fraudulent practices and model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc. before or after sale.

Further, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (12) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that this certificate of approval of the said model shall also cover the weighing instruments of similar make and performance of same series with maximum capacity upto 50kg with verification scale interval (n) in the range of 100 to 10,000 for 'e' value of 100mg to 2g or with verification scale interval (n) in the range of 500 to 10,000 for 'e' value of 5g or more and with 'e' value of 1×10^k , 2×10^k or 5×10^k , k being a positive or negative whole number or equal to zero manufactured by the same manufacturer in accordance with the same principle, design and with the same materials with which, the said approved model has been manufactured.


[F. No. WM-21(154)/2007]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 422.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) तथा बाट और माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और उप-धारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों को प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स ऑरपैट आटोमेशन सिस्टम्स, नं. 25, प्रथम तल, एम ई आई लेआउट, हसाराघाट रोड, बेंगलूर-560 057 द्वारा विनिर्मित मध्यम यथार्थता (यथार्थता वर्ग III) वाले "ओ पी-II" शृंखला के अंकक सूचन सहित स्वतः सूचक अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (प्लेटफार्म प्रकार) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम "ऑरपैट" है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/07/297 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी और प्रकाशित करती है।



उक्त मॉडल एक विकृत गेज प्रकार का भार सेल आधारित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण है। इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 1000 कि.ग्रा. और न्यूनतम क्षमता 4 कि.ग्रा. है। सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (ई) 200 ग्रा. है। इसमें एक आधेयतुलन युक्ति है जिसका शत प्रतिशत व्यवकलनात्मक धारित आधेयतुलन प्रभाव है। प्रकाश उत्सर्जक डायोड (एल ई डी) प्रदर्श परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 230 वोल्ट, 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत प्रदाय पर कार्य करता है।

स्टॉपिंग प्लेट के मुद्रांकन के अतिरिक्त मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोलने से रोकने के लिए सीलबन्द भी किया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पहले या बाद में उसकी सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम, निष्पादन सिद्धांत आदि की शर्तों पर परिवर्तित नहीं किया जाएगा।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (12) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त मॉडल के अनुमोदन के इस प्रमाण-पत्र के अंतर्गत उसी विनिर्माता द्वारा उसी सिद्धांत, डिजाइन के अनुसार और उसी सामग्री से जिससे उक्त अनुमोदित मॉडल का विनिर्माण किया गया है, विनिर्मित उसी शृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो 5 ग्रा. या उससे अधिक के "ई" मान के लिए 500 से 10,000 तक के रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) सहित 50 कि.ग्रा. से अधिक और 5000 कि.ग्रा. तक की अधिकतम क्षमता वाले हैं और "ई मान $1 \times 10^*$, $2 \times 10^*$ या $5 \times 10^*$, के हैं, जो धनात्मक या ऋणात्मक पूर्णांक या शून्य के समतुल्य हैं।


[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(154)/2007]

आर. माथुरबूथम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 8th February, 2008

S.O. 422.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of non-automatic (Platform type) weighing instrument with digital indication of "OP-II" series of medium accuracy (accuracy class-III) and with brand name "ORPAT" (herein referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. Orpat Automation Systems, No. 25, 1st Floor, M.E.I. Layout, Hesaraghatta Road, Bangalore—560 057 and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/07/297;



The said model is a strain gauge type load cell based non-automatic weighing instrument (Platform type) with a maximum capacity of 1000 kg. and minimum capacity of 4 kg. The verification scale interval (e) is 200 g. It has a tare device with 100 per cent subtractive retained tare effect. The Light Emitting Diode (LED) display indicates the weighing result. The instrument operates on 230 Volts and 50 Hertz alternate current power supply.

In addition to sealing the stamping plate, sealing shall also be done to prevent opening of the machine for fraudulent practices model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc. before or after sale.

Further, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (12) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that this certificate of approval of the said model shall also cover the weighing instrument of similar make and performance of same series with maximum capacity upto 5000kg with verification scale interval (n) in the range of 100 to 10,000 for 'e' value of 100mg to 2g or with verification scale interval (n) in the range of 500 to 10,000 for 'e' value of 5g or more and with 'e' value of 1×10^k , 2×10^k or 5×10^k , k being a positive or negative whole number or equal to zero manufactured by the same manufacturer in accordance with the same principle, design and with the same materials with which, the said approved model has been manufactured.


[F. No. WM-21(154)/2007]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 423.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) और बाट तथा माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स मिडको लिमिटेड, मेट्रो एस्टेट, विद्यानगरी मार्ग, कलिना, मुंबई, 400098 महाराष्ट्र द्वारा विनिर्मित 'एम एम एस-आयल मिक्स' श्रृंखला के अंकक सूचक सहित डिस्पेंसिंग पम्प के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्राण्ड का नाम 'मिडको' है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/07/313 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी और प्रकाशित करती है।



स्टाम्पिंग प्लेट को सील करने के अतिरिक्त मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोले जाने से रोकने के लिए भी सीलबन्द किया जाएगा और मॉडल को इसके सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम, वर्किंग सिद्धान्त आदि के रूप में कोई परिवर्तन न किया जा सके।

उक्त मॉडल एक इलैक्ट्रॉनिक आयल मिस्क प्रकार का डिस्पेंसिंग पम्प है जिसमें एक एकल नोजल और नान-रिवरसिबल टोटलाइजर के साथ एक थ्रोजिटिव डिस्पलेसमेंट मीटर लगा हुआ है। इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 9999.99 लीटर है और न्यूनतम डिविजन 10 मि.ली. है। यह उपकरण 220 वाल्ट और 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत पर कार्य करता है। इसका अधिकतम फ्लो दर 35 ली. प्रति मिनट है। इसमें मात्रा और राशि के लिए प्रि-सेट उपकरण लगा है।


[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू.एम-21(145)/2007]

आर. माथुरबूथम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 8th February, 2008

S.O. 423.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the Model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said Model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of Dispensing pump with digital indication with 'MMS-Oil Mix' series and brand name "MIDCO" (herein referred to as the said Model) manufactured by M/s MIDCO Limited, Metro Estate, Vidyanagari Marg, Kalina, Mumbai-400 098, Maharashtra and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/07/313;



In addition to sealing the stamping plate, sealing shall also be done to prevent the opening of the machine for fraudulent practices and model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle etc.

The said model is an electronic oil mix type dispensing pump and consist of positive displacement meter with single nozzle and non reversible totalizer. The maximum flow rate is 35 liter per minute and smallest is 10ml. Its maximum volume display is 9999.99 litre. It operates on 220V, 50Hertz alternate current power supply. It is having pre-set dievice for volume and amount.


[F. No. WM-21(145)/2007]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 424.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) तथा बाट और माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स श्री बैंकटेश्वर स्केल, मोरा मजिद के पास, इतवारी, नागपुर-440 002, महाराष्ट्र द्वारा विनिर्मित उच्च यथार्थता (यथार्थता वर्ग-II) वाले "एस वी एस टी-02" शृंखला के अंकक सूचन सहित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (टेबल टाप प्रकार) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम "ऑरेंज" है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/07/216 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी और प्रकाशित करती है।



उक्त मॉडल एक विकृत गेज प्रकार का भार सेल आधारित (अस्वचालित टेबल टाप) प्रकार का तोलन उपकरण है। इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 30 कि.ग्रा. है और न्यूनतम क्षमता 100 ग्रा. है। सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (ई) 2 ग्रा. है। इसमें एक आधेयतुलन युक्ति है जिसका शत प्रतिशत व्यवकलनात्मक धारित आधेयतुलन प्रभाव है। प्रकाश उत्सर्जक डायोड (एल ई डी) प्रदर्श तोलन परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 230 वोल्ट, 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत प्रदाय पर कार्य करता है।

स्टॉपिंग प्लेट के मुद्रांकन के अतिरिक्त मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोलने से रोकने के लिए सीलबन्द भी किया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पहले या बाद में उसकी सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम निष्पादन सिद्धांत आदि की शर्तों पर परिवर्तित नहीं किया जाएगा।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (12) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त मॉडल को अनुमोदन के इस प्रमाण-पत्र के अंतर्गत उसी विनिर्माता द्वारा उसी सिद्धांत, डिजाइन के अनुसार और उसी सामग्री से जिससे उक्त अनुमोदित मॉडल का विनिर्माण किया गया है, विनिर्मित उसी शृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो 1 मि.ग्रा. से 50 मि. ग्रा. तक के "ई" मान के लिए 100 से 50,000 तक के रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) और 100 मि.ग्रा. या उससे अधिक के "ई" मान के लिए 5000 से 50,000 तक की रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) सहित 50 कि.ग्रा. तक की अधिकतम क्षमता वाले हैं और "ई" मान 1×10^{-6} , 2×10^{-6} या 5×10^{-6} , के हैं, जो धनात्मक या ऋणात्मक पूर्णांक या शून्य के समतुल्य हैं।

[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21 (99)/2007]

आर. माथुरबूधम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 8th February, 2008

S.O. 424.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of non-automatic weighing instrument (Table top type) with digital indication of "SVST-02" series of high accuracy (Accuracy class-II) and with brand name "ORANGE" (herein referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. Shree Vekateshwara Scales, Near Bhora Mazid, Itwari, Nagpur-440 002, Maharashtra and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/07/216;



The said model is a strain gauge type load cell based non-automatic weighing instrument (Table top type) with a maximum capacity of 30 kg. and minimum capacity of 100 g. The verification scale interval (e) is 2 g. It has a tare device with a 100 per cent subtractive retained tare effect. The Light Emitting Diode (LED) display indicates the weighing result. The instrument operates on 230 Volts and 50 Hertz alternative current power supply.

In addition to sealing the stamping plate, sealing shall also be done to prevent the opening of the machine for fraudulent practices and model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc. before or after sale.

Further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (12) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that this certificate of approval of the said model shall also cover the weighing instruments of similar make and performance of same series with maximum capacity upto 50kg. and with number of verification scale interval (n) in the range of 100 to 50,000 for 'e' value of 1mg to 50mg. and with number of verification scale interval (n) in the range of 5000 to 50,000 for 'e' value of 100mg. or more and with 'e' value of 1×10^k , 2×10^k or 5×10^k , k being a positive or negative whole number or equal to zero, manufactured by the same manufacturer in accordance with the same principle, design and with the same materials with which, the said approved model has been manufactured.


[F. No. WM-21(99)/2007]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 425.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) तथा बाट और माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों को प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स श्री बंकटेश्वर स्केल, भोरा मजिद के पास, इतवारी, नागपुर-440 002, महाराष्ट्र द्वारा विनिर्मित मध्यम यथार्थता (यथार्थता वर्ग-III) वाले "एस वी एस टी-03" शृंखला के अंकक सूचन सहित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (टेबल टाप प्रकार) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम "ऑरेंज" है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/07/217 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करती है।



उक्त मॉडल एक विकृत गेज प्रकार का भार सेल आधारित (अस्वचालित टेबलटाप) प्रकार का तोलन उपकरण है। इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 30 कि.ग्रा. है और न्यूनतम क्षमता 100 ग्रा. है। सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (ई) 5 ग्रा. है। इसमें एक आधेयतुलन युक्ति है जिसका शत प्रतिशत व्यक्तनात्मक धारित आधेयतुलन प्रभाव है। प्रकाश उत्सर्जक डायोड (एल ई डी) प्रदर्श तोलन परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 230 वोल्ट और 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत प्रदाय पर कार्य करता है।

स्ट्रॉपिंग प्लेट के मुद्रांकन के अतिरिक्त मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोलने से रोकने के लिए सीलबन्द भी किया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पहले या बाढ़ में उसकी सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम निष्पादन सिद्धांत आदि की शर्तों पर परिवर्तित नहीं किया जाएगा।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (12) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त मॉडल के अनुमोदन के इस प्रमाण-पत्र के अंतर्गत उसी विनिर्माता द्वारा उसी सिद्धांत, डिजाइन के अनुसार और उसी सामग्री से जिससे उक्त अनुमोदित मॉडल का विनिर्माण किया गया है, विनिर्मित उसी शृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो 100 मि.ग्रा. से 2 ग्रा. तक "ई" मान के लिए 100 से 10,000 तक के रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) 5 ग्रा. या उससे अधिक के "ई" मान के लिए 500 से 10,000 तक के रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) सहित 50 कि.ग्रा. से अधिक क्षमता वाले हैं और "ई" मान 1×10^{-6} , 2×10^{-6} या 5×10^{-6} के हैं, जो धनात्मक या ऋणात्मक पूर्णांक या शून्य के समतुल्य हैं।


[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(99)/2007]

आर. माधुरबूथम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 8th February, 2008

S.O. 425.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of non-automatic (Table top type) weighing instrument with digital indication of "SVST-03" series of medium accuracy (Accuracy class-III) and with brand name "ORANGE" (herein referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. Shree Vekateshwara Scales, Near Bhora Mazid, Itwari, Nagpur-440 002, Maharashtra and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/07/217;



The said model is a strain gauge type load cell based non-automatic weighing instrument (Table top type) with a maximum capacity of 30 kg. and minimum capacity of 100 g. The verification scale interval (e) is 5 g. It has a tare device with 100 per cent subtractive retained tare effect. The Light Emitting Diode (LED) display indicates the weighing result. The instrument operates on 230 Volts and 50 Hertz alternative current power supply.

In addition to sealing the stamping plate, sealing shall also be done to prevent the opening of the machine for fraudulent practices and model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc. before or after sale.

Further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (12) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that this certificate of approval of the said model shall also cover the weighing instrument of similar make, accuracy and performance of same series with maximum capacity upto 50kg. with verification scale interval (n) in the range of 100 to 10,000 for 'e' value of 100mg. to 2g. or with verification scale interval (n) in the range of 500 to 10,000 for 'e' value of 5g. or more and with 'e' value of 1×10^k , 2×10^k or 5×10^k , k being a positive or negative whole number or equal to zero manufactured by the same manufacturer in accordance with the same principle, design and with the same materials with which, the said approved model has been manufactured.


[F. No. WM-21(99)/2007]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 426.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) तथा बाट और माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स श्री बेंकटेश्वर स्कल, भोरा मजिद के पास, इतवारी, नागपुर-440 002, महाराष्ट्र द्वारा विनिर्मित उच्च यथार्थता (यथार्थता वर्ग II) वाले "एस टी एस पी-02" शृंखला के अंकक सूचन सहित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (प्लेटफार्म प्रकार) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम "ऑरेंज" है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/07/218 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करती है।



उक्त मॉडल एक विकृत गेज प्रकार का भार सेल आधारित अस्वचालित (प्लेटफार्म प्रकार) तोलन उपकरण है। इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 1000 कि.ग्रा. और न्यूनतम क्षमता 5 कि. ग्रा. है। सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (ई) 100 ग्रा. है। इसमें एक आधेयतुलन युक्ति है जिसका शत प्रतिशत व्यकलनात्मक धारित आधेयतुलन प्रभाव है। प्रकाश उत्सर्जक डायोड (एल ई डी) प्रदर्श परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 230 वोल्ट, 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत प्रदाय पर कार्य करता है।

स्टॉपिंग प्लेट के मुद्रांकन के अतिरिक्त मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोलने से रोकने के लिए सीलबन्द भी किया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पहले या बाद में उसकी सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम निष्पादन सिद्धांत आदि की शर्तों पर परिवर्तित नहीं किया जाएगा।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (12) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त मॉडल के अनुमोदन के इस प्रमाण-पत्र के अंतर्गत उसी विनिर्माता द्वारा उसी सिद्धांत, डिजाइन के अनुसार और उसी सामग्री से जिससे उक्त अनुमोदित मॉडल विनिर्माण किया गया है, विनिर्मित उसी शृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो 1 मि.ग्रा. से 50 मि. ग्रा. तक "ई" मान के लिए 100 से 50,000 तक के रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) सहित 100 मि.ग्रा. या उससे अधिक के "ई" मान के लिए 5000 से 50,000 तक के रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) सहित 50 कि.ग्रा. से अधिक और 5000 कि.ग्रा. तक की अधिकतम क्षमता वाले हैं और "ई" मान 1×10^3 , 2×10^3 या 5×10^3 , के हैं, जो धनात्मक या ऋणात्मक पूर्णांक या शून्य के समतुल्य हैं।


[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(99)/2007]

आर. माथुरबूथम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 8th February, 2008

S.O. 426.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of non-automatic weighing instrument (Platform type) with digital indication of "SVSP-02" series of high accuracy (Accuracy Class-II) and with brand name "ORANGE" (herein referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. Shree Vekateshwara Scales, Near Bhora Mazid, Itwari, Nagpur-440 002, Maharashtra and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/07/218;



The said model is a strain gauge type load cell based non-automatic weighing instrument (Platform type) with a maximum capacity of 1000 kg. and minimum capacity of 5kg. The verification scale interval (e) is 100 g. It has a tare device with 100 percent subtractive retained tare effect. The Light Emitting Diode (LED) display indicates the weighing result. The instrument operates on 230 Volts and 50 Hertz alternative current power supply.

In addition to sealing the stamping plate, sealing shall also be done to prevent opening of the machine for fraudulent practices and model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc. before or after sale.

Further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (12) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that this certificate of approval of the said model shall also cover the weighing instruments of similar make and performance of same series with maximum capacity range above 50kg. and up to 5000kg. and with number of verification scale interval (n) in the range of 100 to 50,000 for 'e' value of 1mg. to 50mg. and with verification scale interval (n) in the range of 5000 to 50,000 for 'e' value of 100mg. or more and with 'e' value of 1×10^k , 2×10^k or 5×10^k , k being a positive or negative whole number or equal to zero manufactured by the same manufacturer in accordance with the same principle, design and with the same materials with which, the said approved model has been manufactured.

[F. No. WM-21(99)/2007]


R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 427.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) तथा बाट और माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों को प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स श्री वेंकटेश्वर स्केल, भोरा मजिद के पास, इतवारी, नागपुर-440 002, महाराष्ट्र द्वारा विनिर्मित मध्यम यथार्थता (यथार्थता वर्ग III) वाले "एस वी एस पी-03" शृंखला के स्वतः सूचक अंकक सूचन अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (प्लेटफार्म प्रकार) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम "ऑरेंज" है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/07/219 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी और प्रकाशित करती है।

उक्त मॉडल एक विकृत गेज प्रकार का भार सेल आधारित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण है। इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 1000 कि.ग्रा. है और न्यूनतम क्षमता 4 कि. ग्रा. है। सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (ई) 200 ग्रा. है। इसमें एक आधेयतुलन युक्ति है जिसका शत प्रतिशत व्यवकलनात्मक धारित आधेयतुलन प्रभाव है। प्रकाश उत्सर्जक डायोड (एल ई डी) प्रदर्श तोलन परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 230 वोल्ट, 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत प्रदाय पर कार्य करता है।



स्टॉपिंग प्लेट के मुद्रांकन के अतिविक्रि मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोलने से रोकने के लिए सीलबन्द भी किया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पहले या बाद में उसकी सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम, निष्पादन सिद्धांत आदि की शर्तों पर परिवर्तित नहीं किया जाएगा।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (12) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त मॉडल के अनुमोदन के इस प्रमाण-पत्र के अंतर्गत उसी विनिर्माता द्वारा उसी सिद्धांत, डिजाइन के अनुसार और उसी सामग्री से जिससे अनुमोदित मॉडल का विनिर्माण किया गया है, विनिर्मित उसी शृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो 5 ग्रा. या उससे अधिक "ई" मान के लिए 500 से 10,000 तक के रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) सहित 50 कि.ग्रा. से अधिक और 5000 कि.ग्रा. तक की अधिकतम क्षमता वाले हैं और "ई" मान $1 \times 10^*$, $2 \times 10^*$ या $5 \times 10^*$, के हैं, जो धनात्मक या ऋणात्मक पूर्णांक या शून्य के समतुल्य हैं।

[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(99)/2007]


आर. माथुरबूथम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 8th February, 2008

S.O. 427.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of the self indicating, non-automatic (Platform type) weighing instrument with digital indication of "SVSP-03" series of high accuracy (Accuracy class-II) and with brand name "ORANGE" (herein referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. Shree Vekateshwara Scales, Near Bhora Mazid, Itwari, Nagpur-440 002, Maharashtra and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/07/219;

The said model is a strain gauge type load cell based non-automatic weighing instrument with a maximum capacity of 1000 kg. and minimum capacity of 4kg. The verification scale interval (e) is 200 g. It has a tare device with 100 per cent subtractive retained tare effect. The Light Emitting Diode (LED) display indicates the weighing result. The instrument operates on 230 Volts and 50 Hertz alternate current power supply.



In addition to sealing the stamping plate, sealing shall also be done to prevent the opening of the machine for fraudulent practices model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc. before or after sale.

Further, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (12) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that this certificate of approval of the said model shall also cover the weighing instruments of similar make and performance of same series with maximum capacity range above 50kg and up to 5000kg and with number of verification scale interval (n) in the range of 500 to 10,000 for 'e' value of 5g or more and with 'e' value of 1×10^k , 2×10^k or 5×10^k , k being a positive or negative whole number or equal to zero manufactured by the same manufacturer in accordance with the same principle, design and with the same materials with which, the said approved model has been manufactured.

[F. No. WM-21(99)/2007]


R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 12 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 428.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) तथा बाट और माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स सक्सेस ट्रेडिंग कम्पनी, 40, योगन्द्र नगर, नागपुर-440013, महाराष्ट्र द्वारा विनिर्मित मध्यम यथार्थता (यथार्थता वर्ग III) वाले “एस टी डब्ल्यू” श्रृंखला के अंकक सूचन सहित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (वे ब्रिज प्रकार) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम “सनटेक” है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/2007/201 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी और प्रकाशित करती है।

उक्त मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) एक विकृत गेज प्रकार का भार सैल आधारित स्वचालित (वे ब्रिज प्रकार का) तोलन उपकरण है। इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 50 टन है और न्यूनतम क्षमता 200 कि.ग्राम है। सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (ई) 10 कि.ग्रा. है। इसमें एक आधेयतुलन युक्ति है जिसका शत प्रतिशत व्यवलनात्मक धारित आधेयतुलन प्रभाव है। प्रकाश उत्सर्जक डायोड (एल ई डी) प्रदर्श तोलन परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 230 वोल्ट, 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत प्रदाय पर कार्य करता है।



स्टॉपिंग प्लेट के मुद्रांकन के अतिवृत्ति मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोलने से रोकने के लिए सीलबन्ध भी किया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पहले या बाद में उसकी सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम कार्यकारी सिद्धांत आदि की शर्तों के संबंध में परिवर्तित नहीं किया जाएगा।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (12) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त मॉडल के अनुमोदन के इस प्रमाण-पत्र के अंतर्गत उसी विनिर्माता द्वारा उसी सिद्धांत, डिजाइन के अनुसार और उसी सामग्री से जिससे उक्त अनुमोदित मॉडल का निर्माण किया गया है, विनिर्मित उसी श्रृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो 5 ग्रा. या उससे अधिक के “ई” मान के लिए 500 से 10,000 तक की रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) सहित 5 टन से अधिक और 150 टन तक की अधिकतम क्षमता वाले हैं और “ई” मान 1×10^3 , 2×10^3 या 5×10^3 , के हैं, जो धनात्मक या ऋणात्मक पूर्णांक या शून्य के समतुल्य हैं।

[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(90)/2007]



आर. माथुरबूधम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 12th February, 2008

S.O. 428.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of non-automatic weighing instrument (weighbridge type) with digital indication of "STW" series belonging to medium accuracy (Accuracy class-III) and with brand name "SUNTECH" (herein referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. Success Trading Co., 40, Yogendra Nagar, Nagpur—440013, Maharashtra and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/07/201;

The said model is a strain gauge type load cell based non-automatic weighing instrument (weighbridge type) with a maximum capacity of 50 tonne and minimum capacity of 200kg. The verification scale interval (e) is 10kg. It has a tare device with a 100 percent subtractive retained tare effect. The Light Emitting Diode (LED) display indicates the weighing result. The instrument operates on 230 Volts and 50 Hertz alternate current power supply.



In addition to sealing the stamping plate sealing shall also be done to prevent opening of the machine for fraudulent practices model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc. before or after sale.

Further, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (12) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that this certificate of approval of the said model shall also cover the weighing instruments of similar make, accuracy and performance of same series with maximum capacity above 5 tonne and up to 150 tonne with verification scale interval (n) in the range of 500 to 10,000 for 'e' value of 5g or more and with 'e' value of 1×10^k , 2×10^k or 5×10^k , k being a positive or negative whole number or equal to zero manufactured by the same manufacturer in accordance with the same principle, design and with the same materials with which, the said approved model have been manufactured.

[F. No. WM-21(90)/2007]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 12 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 429.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) तथा बाट और माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों को प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स आर ए एम स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज, जे इमाम नगर सर्कल, बेथुर रोड, दावनगरे-577 001 कर्नाटक द्वारा विनिर्मित उच्च यथार्थता (यथार्थता वर्ग II) वाले "आर एस आई-जे पी" शृंखला के अंकक सूचन सहित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (टेबलटाप प्रकार) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम "आर.ए.एम" है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/07/277 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी और प्रकाशित करती है।



उक्त मॉडल एक विकृत गेज प्रकार का भार सेल आधारित अस्वचालित (टेबलटाप प्रकार) तोलन उपकरण है। इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 30 कि.ग्रा. है और न्यूनतम क्षमता 100 ग्रा. है। सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (ई) 2 ग्रा. है। इसमें एक आधेयतुलन युक्ति जिसका शत प्रतिशत घ्यकलनात्मक धारित आधेयतुलन प्रभाव है। प्रकाश उत्सर्जक डायोड (एल ई डी) प्रदर्श तोलन परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 230 वोल्ट 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत प्रदाय पर कार्य करता है।

स्टॉपिंग प्लेट के मुद्रांकन के अतिक्रमण मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोलने से रोकने के लिए सीलबन्द भी किया जाएगा और मॉडल को बिक्री से पहले या बाद में उसकी सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम निष्पादन सिद्धांत आदि की शर्तों पर परिवर्तित नहीं किया जाएगा।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (12) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त मॉडल के अनुमोदन के इस प्रमाण-पत्र के अंतर्गत उसी विनिर्माता द्वारा उसी सिद्धांत, डिजाइन के अनुसार और उसी सामग्री से जिससे उक्त अनुमोदित मॉडल का विनिर्माण किया गया है, विनिर्मित उसी शृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो 1 मि.ग्रा. से 50 मि.ग्रा. के "ई" मान के लिए 100 से 50,000 तक के रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) और 100 मि.ग्रा. या उससे अधिक के "ई" मान के लिए 5000 से 50,000 तक की रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) सहित 50 कि.ग्रा. तक की अधिकतम क्षमता वाले हैं और "ई" मान 1×10^{-6} , 2×10^{-6} या 5×10^{-6} , के हैं, जो धनात्मक या ऋणात्मक पूर्णांक या शून्य के समतुल्य हैं।


[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(135)/2007]

आर. माथुरबूथम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 12th February, 2008

S.O. 429.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of non-automatic weighing instrument (Tabletop type) with digital indication of "RSI-JP" series of high accuracy (Accuracy class-II) and with brand name "R.A.M." (herein referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. R.A.M. Scale Industries, J. Imam Nagar Circle, Bethur Road, Davangere—577 001, Karnataka and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/07/277;



The said model is a strain gauge type load cell based non-automatic weighing instrument (Tabletop type) with a maximum capacity of 30 kg. and minimum capacity of 100kg. The verification scale interval (e) is 2g. It has a tare device with a 100 percent subtractive retained tare effect. The Light Emitting Diode (LED) display indicates the weighing result. The instrument operates on 230 Volts and 50 Hertz alternative current power supply.

In addition to sealing the stamping plate sealing shall also be done to prevent opening of the machine for fraudulent practices model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc. before or after sale.

Further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (12) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that this certificate of approval of the said model shall also cover the weighing instruments of similar make, and performance of same series with maximum capacity up to 50 kg and with number of verification scale interval (n) in the range of 100 to 50000 for 'e' value of 1mg to 50mg and with number of verification scale interval (n) in the range of 5000 to 50,000 for 'e' value of 100mg or more and with 'e' value of 1×10^k , 2×10^k or 5×10^k , k being a positive or negative whole number or equal to zero, manufactured by the same manufacturer in accordance with the same principle, design and with the same materials with which, the said approved model has been manufactured.


[F. No. WM-21(135)/2007]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

नई दिल्ली, 12 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 430.—केन्द्रीय सरकार का, विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा उसे प्रस्तुत रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त रिपोर्ट में वर्णित मॉडल (नीचे दी गई आकृति देखें) बाट और माप मानक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 60) तथा बाट और माप मानक (मॉडलों का अनुमोदन) नियम, 1987 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप है और इस बात की संभावना है कि लगातार प्रयोग की अवधि में भी उक्त मॉडल यथार्थता बनाए रखेगा और विभिन्न परिस्थितियों में उपयुक्त सेवा प्रदान करता रहेगा;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (7) और उपधारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स आर ए एम स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज, जे इमाम नगर सर्कल, बेथुर रोड, दावनगरे-577 001 कर्नाटक द्वारा विनिर्मित मध्यम यथार्थता (यथार्थता वर्ग-III) "आर एस आई-पी टी" शृंखला के अंकक सूचन सहित स्वतः सूचक, अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण (प्लेटफार्म प्रकार) के मॉडल का, जिसके ब्रांड का नाम "आर ए एम" है (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त मॉडल कहा गया है) और जिसे अनुमोदन चिह्न आई एन डी/09/07/278 समनुदेशित किया गया है, अनुमोदन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी और प्रकाशित करती है।



उक्त मॉडल एक विकृत गेज प्रकार का भार सेल आधारित अस्वचालित तोलन उपकरण है। इसकी अधिकतम क्षमता 1,000 कि.ग्रा. है और न्यूनतम क्षमता 4 कि.ग्रा. है। सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (ई) 200 ग्रा. है। इसमें एक आधेयतुलन युक्ति है जिसका शत प्रतिशत व्यवहलनात्मक धारित आधेयतुलन प्रभाव है। प्रकाश उत्सर्जक डायोड (एल ई डी) प्रदर्श तोलन परिणाम उपदर्शित करता है। उपकरण 230 वोल्ट, 50 हर्ट्ज प्रत्यावर्ती धारा विद्युत प्रदाय पर कार्य करता है।

स्टॉपिंग प्लेट के मुद्रांकन के अतिविक्रि मशीन को कपटपूर्ण व्यवहारों के लिए खोलने से रोकने के लिए सीलबन्द भी किया जाएगा और मॉडल को विक्री से पहले या बाद में उसकी सामग्री, यथार्थता, डिजाइन, सर्किट डायग्राम निष्पादन सिद्धांत आदि की शर्तों पर परिवर्तित नहीं किया जाएगा।

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 36 की उप-धारा (12) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त मॉडल के अनुमोदन के इस प्रमाण-पत्र के अंतर्गत उसी विनिर्माता द्वारा उसी सिद्धांत, डिजाइन के अनुसार और उसी सामग्री से जिससे उक्त अनुमोदित मॉडल का विनिर्माण किया गया है, विनिर्मित उसी शृंखला के वैसे ही मेक, यथार्थता और कार्यपालन के तोलन उपकरण भी होंगे जो 5 ग्रा. या उससे अधिक के "ई" मान के लिए 500 से 10,000 तक की रेंज में सत्यापन मापमान अंतराल (एन) सहित 50 कि.ग्रा. से अधिक और 5000 कि.ग्रा. तक की अधिकतम क्षमता वाले हैं और "ई" मान $1 \times 10^*$, $2 \times 10^*$ या $5 \times 10^*$, के हैं, जो धनात्मक या ऋणात्मक पूर्णांक या शून्य के समतुल्य हैं।


[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम-21(135)/2007]

आर. माथुरबूथम, निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान

New Delhi, the 12 February, 2008

S.O. 430.—Whereas the Central Government, after considering the report submitted to it by the prescribed authority, is satisfied that the model described in the said report (see the figure given below) is in conformity with the provisions of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976 (60 of 1976) and the Standards of Weights and Measures (Approval of Models) Rules, 1987 and the said model is likely to maintain its accuracy over periods of sustained use and to render accurate service under varied conditions;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby issues and publishes the certificate of approval of the model of the self indicating non-automatic (Platform type) weighing instrument with digital indication of "RSI-PT" series of medium accuracy (Accuracy class-II) and with brand name "R.A.M." (herein referred to as the said model), manufactured by M/s. R.A.M. Scale Industries, J. Imam Nagar Circle, Bethur Road, Davangere-577 001, Karnataka and which is assigned the approval mark IND/09/07/278;



The said model is a strain gauge type load cell based non-automatic weighing instrument with a maximum capacity of 1000 kg. and minimum capacity of 4 kg. The verification scale interval (e) is 200 kg. It has a tare device with 100 per cent subtractive retained tare effect. The Light Emitting Diode (LED) display indicates the weighing result. The instrument operates on 230 Volts and 50 Hertz alternate current power supply.

In addition to sealing the stamping plate sealing shall also be done to prevent the opening of the machine for fraudulent practices model shall not be changed in terms of its material, accuracy, design, circuit diagram, working principle, etc. before or after sale.

Further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (12) of Section 36 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that this certificate of approval of the said model shall also cover the weighing instruments of same series with maximum capacity above 50kg and up to 5000 kg. and with the number of verification scale interval (n) in the range of 500 to 10,000 for 'e' value of 5g. or more and with 'e' value of 1×10^k , 2×10^k or 5×10^k , k being a positive or negative whole number or equal to zero manufactured by the same manufacturer with the same principle, design and with the same materials with which, the said approved model has been manufactured.

[F. No. WM-21(135)/2007]

R. MATHURBOOTHAM, Director of Legal Metrology

(भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो)

नई दिल्ली, 13 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 431.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि नीचे अनुसूची में दिये गये मानक(कों) में संशोधन किया गया/किये गये हैं :-

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	संशोधित भारतीय मानक(कों) की संख्या, वर्ष और शीर्षक	संशोधन की संख्या और तिथि	संशोधन लागू होने की तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
2.	आई एस 1554 (भाग 1) : 1988 की संशोधन संख्या 3	03 नवम्बर 2007	12-02-2008

इस भारतीय संशोधन की प्रतियाँ भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9, बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों : नई दिल्ली, कोलकाता, चण्डीगढ़, चेन्नई, मुम्बई तथा शाखा कार्यालयों : अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, नागपुर, पटना, पुणे तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में विक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं ।

[सं. ईटी 09/टी-12]

पी. के. मुखर्जी-वैज्ञानिक 'एफ' व प्रमुख (विद्युत् तकनीकी)

(BUREAU OF INDIAN STANDARDS)

New Delhi, the 13th February, 2008

S. O. 431.—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that amendment to the Indian Standards, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed has been issued :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. and Year of the Indian Standards	No. and Year of Amendments	Date from which the Amendments shall have effect
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
2.	IS 1554 (Part 1) : 1988 Specification for PVC Insulated (Heavy Duty) Electric Cables Part 1 For working voltages up to and including 1100 V (Third Revision)	03 November, 2007	12-02-2008

Copy of this Amendment is available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110 002 and Regional Offices : New Delhi, Kolkata, Chandigarh, Chennai, Mumbai and also Branch Offices : Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneshwar, Coimbatore, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Nagpur, Patna, Pune and Thiruvananthapuram.

[No. : ET 09/T-12]

P. K. MUKHERJEE, Scientist 'F' & Head (Elect. Technical)

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 432.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम, 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिस भारतीय मानकों का विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिया गया है वह स्थापित हो गया है :-

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	स्थापित भारतीय मानक(कों) की संख्या, वर्ष और शीर्षक	नये भारतीय मानक द्वारा अतिक्रमित भारतीय मानक अथवा मानकों, यदि कोई हो, की संख्या और वर्ष	स्थापित तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

1.	आईएस 60320-2-2 :1998 घरेलू और ऐसे ही सामान्य प्रयोजनों के लिए साधित्र युग्मक भाग 2-2 घरेलू और समान उपस्करों के लिए अंतः संयोजन युग्मक	—	30 नवम्बर, 2008
----	--	---	-----------------

इस भारतीय मानक की प्रतियाँ भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9, बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों : नई दिल्ली, कोलकाता, चण्डीगढ़, चेन्नई, मुम्बई तथा शाखा कार्यालयों : अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, नागपुर, पटना, पुणे तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[सं. ई टी 14/टी-81]

पी.के. मुखर्जी, वैज्ञानिक 'एफ' एवं प्रमुख, (विद्युत् तकनीकी)

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2008

S. O. 432.—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies the Indian Standards, particulars of which is given in the Schedule hereto annexed have been issued :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. and year of the Indian Standards	No. and year of Indian Standards, if any, Superseded by the New Indian Standard	Date of Established
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	IS/IEC 60320-2-2 : 1998 Appliance couplers for Household and similar general purposes Part 2-2 Interconnection couplers for household and similar equipment	—	30th November, 2007

Copy of this Standard is available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Offices : New Delhi, Kolkata, Chandigarh, Chennai, Mumbai and also Branch Offices : Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Coimbatore, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Nagpur, Patna, Pune and Thiruvananthapuram.

[No. : ET 14/T-81]

P.K. MUKHERJEE, Scientist F & Head (Elect. Technical)

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 433.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम, 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि नीचे अनुसूची में दिये गये मानक(कों) में संशोधन किया गया/किये गये हैं :—

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	संशोधित भारतीय मानक की संख्या, वर्ष और शीर्षक	संशोधन की संख्या और तिथि	संशोधन लागू होने की तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	आई एस 14413 : 1996 स्वचल वाहन-दो पहिये और तिपहिये वाहनों के लिए दिशा-सूचक और नियंत्रण युक्तियाँ	संशोधन संख्या 1, दिसम्बर, 2007	31 दिसम्बर, 2007

इन संशोधनों की प्रतियाँ भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9, बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों : नई दिल्ली, कोलकाता, चण्डीगढ़, चेन्नई, मुम्बई तथा शाखा कार्यालयों : अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जबपुर, कानपुर, नागपुर, पटना, पूणे तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[सं. टीईडी/जी-16]

राकेश कुमार, वैज्ञानिक 'एफ' एवं प्रमुख (टीईडी)

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2008

S. O. 433.—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that amendments to the Indian Standards, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed have been issued :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. year and title of the Indian Standards	No. and year of the amendment	Date from which the amendment shall have effect
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	IS 14413 : 1996 Automotive vehicles-Telltale symbols and controls on two-wheeled and three-wheeled vehicles	Amendment No.1, December, 2007	31 December, 2007

Copy of these amendments are available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Offices : New Delhi, Kolkata, Chandigarh, Chennai, Mumbai and also Branch Offices : Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Coimbatore, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Nagpur, Patna, Pune and Thiruvananthapuram.

[Ref.: TED/G-16]

RAKESH KUMAR, Sc.-'F' & Head (Transport Engg.)

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 434.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो (प्रमाणन) विनियम, 1988 के नियम 4 के उपनियम (5) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिन लाइसेंसों के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिये गये हैं, वे स्वीकृत कर दिए गए हैं :—

अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	लाइसेंस संख्या	लाइसेंस प्रदान करने की तिथि	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	भा मा संख्या एवं भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	9628701	01-10-2007	मैसर्स शीतल प्रसाद पाइप फैक्टरी 5/2/21, साहेबगंज, जिला फैजाबाद, यू पी-224 001	आईएस 458 : 2003 पूर्व ढले कंक्रीट पाइप
2.	9629602	08-10-2007	मैसर्स मिल्क फूड लिमिटेड गाँव मुगलपुर यू आरएफ अग्वानपुर कंथ रोड, जिला मुरादाबाद उत्तर प्रदेश-224 001	आईएस 13334 : भाग 2 : 1992 मलाईयुक्त दूध पाउडर भाग 2 अतिरिक्त ग्रेड
3.	9629703	08-10-2007	मैसर्स कीर्ति कुंज ज्वेलर्स मखदूम शाहधन चाहरसु चौराहा जिला जौनपुर, यू पी-222 001	आईएस 1417 : 1999 स्वर्ण एवं स्वर्ण मिश्र आभूषण/शिल्पकारी— शुद्धता व मुहरांकन
4.	9629804	08-10-2007	मैसर्स रतनदीप ज्वेलर्स जेल रोड, सिविल लाइन्स, जिला मुरादाबाद, यू पी-224 001	आईएस 1417 : 1999 स्वर्ण एवं स्वर्ण मिश्र आभूषण/शिल्पकारी— शुद्धता व मुहरांकन
5.	9630280	10-10-2007	मैसर्स जैन ज्वेलर्स 332/4 खत्री मार्किट चौक सराफा जिला लखनऊ, यू पी-226 003	आईएस 2112 : 2003 चांदी एवं चांदी मिश्र आभूषण/शिल्पकारी— शुद्धता व मुहरांकन
6.	9631383	16-10-2007	मैसर्स राम कुमार अग्रवाल ज्वेलर्स शिवाजी मार्ग, जिला बरेली, उत्तर प्रदेश-243 004	आईएस 1417 : 1999 स्वर्ण एवं स्वर्ण मिश्र आभूषण/शिल्पकारी— शुद्धता व मुहरांकन

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
7.	9631888	18-10-2007	मैसर्स मिलक फूड लिमिटेड गाँव मुगलपुर यूआरएफ अम्बानपुर कंध रोड जिला मुरादाबाद, उत्तर प्रदेश 244 001	आईएस 1165 : 2002 दूध पाउडर
8.	9632082	23-10-2007	मैसर्स शिर्डी इंडस्ट्रीज लि., प्लॉट सं. 1 सेक्टर 9, आई आई ई, पंत नगर, जिला यू एस नगर, उत्तराखंड 263 153	आईएस 12406 : 2003 सामान्य प्रयोजन के लिए मध्यम घनत्व के फाइबर बोर्ड
9.	9634187	02-11-2007	मैसर्स जैन डायमण्ड्स, जेल रोड समीप हैड पोस्ट ऑफिस, जिला मुरादाबाद, उत्तर प्रदेश 244 001	आईएस 1417 : 1999 स्वर्ण एवं स्वर्ण मिश्र आभूषण/शिल्पकारी- शुद्धता व मुहरांकन
10.	9635492	08-11-2007	मैसर्स राम निवास सराफ एंड कं., उर्दू बाजार, हरबंस गली गीता प्रेस, जिला गोरखपुर, उत्तर प्रदेश 273 001	आईएस 1417 : 1999 स्वर्ण एवं स्वर्ण मिश्र आभूषण/शिल्पकारी- शुद्धता व मुहरांकन
11.	9635997	14-11-2007	मैसर्स जी डी पॉवर इक्यूपमेंट्स (आई) प्रा. लि., 47, गुरु गोविंद सिंह मार्ग, हुसैनगंज क्रॉसिंग के पास, जिला लखनऊ, उत्तर प्रदेश 226 001	आईएस 8783 : भाग 4/खंड 1 : 1995 निमज्जनीय मोटर के लिए वाईडिंग वायर भाग 4 : अलग-अलग तारों की विशिष्ट खंड 1 : एच आर पीवीसी विद्युतरोधी तार
12.	9637803	30-11-2007	मैसर्स आर के शाह पॉलिटयूब्स के-47/344 विशेषरंगंज, जिला वाराणसी, उत्तर प्रदेश 221 001	आईएस 9537 : भाग 3 : 1983 विद्युत संस्थापन के लिए कंडयूट भाग 3 कंडयूट विद्युतरोधक सामग्री के लिए दृढ़ सांद्र
13.	9638603	05-12-2007	मैसर्स गलवालिया इस्पात उद्योग लिमिटेड, नारायण नगर इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, बाजपुर रोड, काशीपुर, यू एस नगर, उत्तराखंड 244 713	आईएस 2062 : 2006 सामान्य संरचनात्मक प्रयोजन के लिए इस्पात
14.	9639201	07-12-2007	मैसर्स त्रिदेव पम्प्स (प्रा) लि., खुशालपुर, पी ए सी रोड, (मिनी बाईपास) समीप टावर, जिला मुरादाबाद उत्तर प्रदेश 244 001	आईएस 15500 : भाग 7: 2004 गहराई से पानी निकालने के हथवरमें घटक एवं विशेष औजार-रबड़ घटक
15.	9639302	11-12-2007	मैसर्स अथर्व डिसट्रीलरीज (प्रा) लि., बी-1/14 अलीगंज, लखनऊ उत्तर प्रदेश 226 020	आईएस 14543 : 2004 बोतलबंद पेय जल (बोतलबंद खनिज जल के अलावा)
16.	9640081	13-12-2007	मैसर्स म्युचुअल क्राफ्ट (प्रा) लि., प्लॉट नं ए-1, एल्डीको-सिडूल इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, पोस्ट ऑफिस-सितारगंज, उत्तर प्रदेश 262 403	आईएस 4151 : 1993 स्कूटर एवं मोटर साइकिल सवारों के लिए संरक्षी हेलमेट
17.	9640687	14-12-2007	मैसर्स पूरन सिंह त्रिलोचन सिंह ज्वेलर्स एम 3 गोल मार्केट महानगर, जिला लखनऊ, उत्तर प्रदेश 226 006	आईएस 1417 : 1999 सवर्ण एवं स्वर्ण मिश्र आभूषण/शिल्पकारी-शुद्धता व मुहरांकन

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
18.	9641588	14-12-2007	मैसर्स टिटु प्लाई वुड टिटु प्लाई वुड, बाई पास रोड, तुलसीपुर जिला बलरामपुर, उत्तर प्रदेश 271 208	आईएस 303 : 1989 सामान्य प्रयोजन के लिए प्लाई वुड
19.	9641689	14-12-2007	मैसर्स टिटु प्लाई वुड टिटु प्लाई वुड, बाई पास रोड, तुलसीपुर जिला बलरामपुर, उत्तर प्रदेश 271 208	आईएस 1659 : 2004 ब्लॉक बोर्ड
20.	9641790	14-12-2007	मैसर्स टिटु प्लाई वुड टिटु प्लाई वुड, बाई पास रोड, तुलसीपुर जिला बलरामपुर, उत्तर प्रदेश 271 208	आईएस 2202 (भाग 1) : 1999 लकड़ी के फ्लश डोर शटर (ठोस कोर प्रकार) भाग 1 प्लाई वुड फेस पैनल
21.	9642186	20-12-2007	मैसर्स पूरन सिंह त्रिलोचन सिंह, 62 श्री राम रोड अमीनाबाद, जिला लखनऊ, उत्तर प्रदेश 226 020	आईएस 1417 : 1999 सवर्ण एवं स्वर्ण मिश्र. आभूषण/शिल्पकारी- शुद्धता व मुहरांकन

[सं. सीएमडी/13 : 11]

ए.के. तलवार, उप महानिदेशक (मुहर)

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2008

S. O. 434.—In pursuance of Sub-regulation (5) of the regulation 4 of the Bureau of Indian Standards (Certification) Regulations 1988, of the Bureau of Indian Standards, hereby notifies that the licence particulars of which are given below have been granted with effect from the date indicated against each: (01-10-2007 to 31-12-2007)

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licences No. CM/L	Date of Grant of Licence	Name & Address of the Licensee	Article/Process with relevant Indian Standards covered by the licence Granted
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	9628701	01-10-2007	M/s. Sheetal Prasad Pipe Factory 5/2/21, Sahebganj, Sahebganj Distt. : Faizabad, U.P.-224001	IS 458 : 2003 Precast Concrete Pipes
2.	9629602	08-10-2007	M/s. Milk Food Limited Village Mugalpur urf Agwanpur Kanth Road, Distt. Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh-244 001	IS 13334 : Part 2 : 1992 silk Milk Powder— Part 2 : Extra Grade
3.	9629703	08-10-2007	M/s. Kirti Kunj Jewellery Makhdoom Shahdhan Chaharsu Chauraha Distt. : Jaunpur, U.P.-222001	IS 1417 : 1999 Gold and Gold Alloys, Jewellery Artefacts-Fineness and Marking
4.	9629804	08-10-2007	M/s. Ratandeep Jewellers Jail Road, Civil Lines, Distt. Moradabad, U.P.-244001	IS 1417 : 1999 Gold and Gold Alloys, Jewellery/Artefacts-Fineness and Marking
5.	9630280	10-10-2007	M/s. Jain Jewellers 332/4, Khatri Market Chowk Saraffa, Distt. Lucknow, U.P.-226001	IS : 2112 : 2003 Silver and Silver Alloys, Jewellery/Artefacts-Fineness and Marking
6.	9631383	16-10-2007	M/s. Ram Kumar Agrawal Sarraf Shivaji Marg, Distt : Bareilly, U.P.-243004	IS 1417 : 1999 Gold and Gold Alloys, Jewellery/Artefacts-Fineness and Marking

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
7.	9631888	18-10-2007	M/s. Milk Food Limited Village - Mugalpur urf Agwanpur Kanth Road, Distt. : Moradabad U.P.-244001	IS 1165 : 2002 Milk Powder
8.	9632082	23-10-2007	M/s. Shirdi Industries Ltd., Plot No. 1, Sector No. 9, IIE, Pant Nagar Distt. U S Nagar, Uttarakhand-263153	IS 12406 : 2003 Medium Density Fibre Boards for General Purpose
9.	9634187	02-11-2007	M/s. Jain diamonds Jail Road Near Head Post Office, Distt. Moradabad, U.P.-244001	IS 1417 : 1999 Gold and Gold Alloys, Jewellery/Artefacts-Fineness and Marking
10.	9635492	08-11-2007	M/s. Ram Niwas Saraf & Co. Urdu Bazar, Harbans Gali Geeta Press, Distt. : Gorakhpur, U.P.-273001	IS 1417 : 1999 Gold and Gold Alloys, Jewellery/Artefacts-Fineness and Marking
11.	9635997	14-11-2007	M/s. G D Power Equipments (I) Pvt. Ltd., 47, Guru Govind Singh Marg, Near Husain Ganj Crossing, Distt : Lucknow, U.P.-226001	IS 8783 : Part 4 : Sec. 1 : 1995 Winding Wires for Submersible Motors - Part 4 : Specification for Individual Wires - Section 1 : HR PVC Insulated Wires
12.	9637803	30-11-2007	M/s. R K Shah Poly tubes K-47/344, Visheswarganj, Distt. Varanasi, U.P.-221001	IS 9537: Part 3 : 1983 Conduits for electrical installations : Part 3 Rigid plain conduits of insulating materials
13.	9638603	05-12-2007	M/s. Galwalia Ispat Udyog Limited Narai in Nagar Industrial Area, Bajpur Road, Kashipur, U S Nagar, Uttarakhand-244713	IS 2062 : 2006 Steel for General Structural Purposes
14.	9639201	07-12-2007	M/s. Tridev Pumps (P) Ltd., Khushalpur, P.A.C. Road, (Mini bypass) Near Tower, Distt. : Moradabad, U.P.-244001	IS 15500 : Part 7 : 2004 Deepwell hand- pumps, Components and Special Tools- Rubber components
15.	9639302	11-12-2007	M/s. Atharv Distilleries (P) Ltd., B-1/14, Aliganj, Lucknow, U.P.-226020	IS 14543 : 2004 Packaged Drinking Water (other than Packaged Natural Mineral Water)
16.	9640081	13-12-2007	M/s. Mutual Crafts (P) Ltd., Plot No. A-1 Eldeco-Sidul industrial Area Post Office - Sitargang, U.S. Nagar-262403	IS 4151 : 1993 Protective helmets for scooter and motorcycle riders
17.	9640687	14-12-2007	M/s. Puran Singh Trilochan Singh Jewellers 3 Gole Market Mahanagar, Distt. : Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh-226006	IS 1417 : 1999 Gold and Gold Alloys, Jewellery/Artefacts-Fineness and Marking
18.	9641588	14-12-2007	M/s. Titu Ply Wood Titu Ply Wood, By Pass Road, Tulsipur, Distt. Balrampur, Uttar Pradesh-271208	IS 303 : 1989 Plywood for General Purposes

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
19.	9641689	14-12-2007	M/s. Titu Ply Wood, Titu Ply Wood, By Pass Road, Tulsipur, Distt. Balrampur, Uttar Pradesh-271208	IS 1659 : 2004 Block Boards
20.	9641790	14-12-2007	M/s. Titu Ply Wood, Titu Ply Wood, By Pass Road, Tulsipur, Distt. Balrampur, Uttar Pradesh-271208	IS 2202 (Part 1) 1999 : 2004, Wooden flush door shutters (solid core type) : Part 1 Ply wood face panels
21.	9642186	20-12-2007	M/s. Puran Singh Trilochan Singh, 62, Shri Ram Road Aminabad, Distt. Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh-226020	IS 1417 : 1999 Gold and Gold Alloys, Jewellery/Artefacts-Fineness and Marking

[No. CMD/13:11]

A. K. TALWAR, Dy. Director General (Marks)

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 435.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो (प्रमाणन) विनियम, 1988 के विनियम (5) के उप-विनियम (6) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि निम्न विवरण वाले लाइसेंसों को उनके आगे दर्शायी गई तारीख से रद्द/स्थगित कर दिया गया है :-

अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	लाइसेंस संख्या सीएम/एल	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	लाइसेंस के अंतर्गत वस्तु/प्रक्रम सम्बद्ध भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक	रद्द/स्थगित करने की तिथि
1.	7718385	भारत इलेक्ट्रिक इंडस्ट्रीज, शॉप सं. 18, नेताजी चौक, उल्हास नगर-421005	आईएस 1534 (भाग 1): 1977 फ्लोरोसेंट प्रतिदीप्ति बत्ती के लिए चौक भाग 1 स्विच स्टार्ट परिपथ हेतु	12-11-2007

[सं. सीएमडी-13:13]

ए. के. तलवार, उप महानिदेशक (मुहर)

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2008

S. O. 435.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (6) of the regulation 5 of the Bureau of Indian Standards (Certification) Regulations 1988, of the Bureau of Indian Standards, hereby notifies that the licences particulars of which are given below have been cancelled/suspended with effect from the date indicated against each :—

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licences No. CM/L	Name & Address of the Licensee	Article/Process with relevant Indian Standards covered by the licence Cancelled/suspension	Date of Cancellation/suspension
1.	7718385	Bharat Electric Industries, Shop No 18, Netaji Chowk Ulhasnagar-421005	IS 1534 (Part 1) : 1977 240 v, 0.38A, 50Hz, cost 5, ac, copper wound	12-11-2007

[No. CMD/13:13]

A. K. TALWAR, Dy. Director General (Marks)

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 436.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो (प्रमाणन) विनियम, 1988 के विनियम (5) के उप-विनियम (6) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि निम्न विवरण वाले लाइसेंसों को उनके आगे दर्शायी गई तारीख से रद्द/स्थगित कर दिया गया है :-

अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	लाइसेंस संख्या सीएम/एल	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	लाइसेंस के अंतर्गत वस्तु/प्रक्रम सम्बद्ध भारतीय मानक का शीर्षक	रद्द/स्थगित करने की तिथि
1.	9342780	मैसर्स आम्बिका प्लाईवुड इंड. (प्रा) लि., गांव-इंद्रपुर, तहसील-बिलासपुर जिला: रामपुर, उत्तर प्रदेश	आईएस 1328:1996 परतचढ़ी सजावटी प्लाईवुड	06-11-2007
2.	9029574	मैसर्स कनोरिया केमीकल्स एंड इंडस्ट्रीज लि., पी.ओ. रेनकूट, जिला: सोनभद्रा, उत्तर प्रदेश-231217	आईएस 632:1978 गामा-बीएचसी (लिंग्डेन) पायसनीय सांद्र	18-10-2007
3.	9089188	मैसर्स के सरबही एण्ड कं., 29, इटकी मोहल्ला, नदन महल रोड, जिला: लखनऊ, उत्तरप्रदेश-226004	आईएस 1971:1996 फसल संरक्षक उपस्कर हस्त चालित स्ट्रॉप नुमा स्प्रेयर	12-12-2007
4.	8305668	मैसर्स गीता होम एप्लायंसेस, एकता विहार फेस 3, गैस गोदाम रोड, कुसुम खेडा, हल्द्वानी, जिला नैनीताल	आईएस 4246:2002 एलपीजी के साथ प्रयुक्त घरेलू गैस चूल्हा	14-12-2007

[सं. सीएमडी-13:13]

ए. के. तलवार, उप महानिदेशक (मुहर)

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2008

S. O. 436.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (6) of the regulation 5 of the Bureau of Indian Standards (Certification) Regulations 1988, of the Bureau of Indian Standards, hereby notifies that the licence particulars of which are given below have been Cancelled/suspended with effect from the date indicated against each (Period from 01-10-2007 to 31-12-2007.)

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licences No. CM/L	Name & Address of the Licensee	Article/Process with relevant Indian Standards covered by the licence Cancelled/suspension	Date of Cancellation/suspension
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	9342780	M/s Ambika Plywood Ind. (P) Ltd. Village-Inder Pur, Tehsil-Bilaspur, Distt. Rampur, U.P.	IS:1328:1996 Veneered Decorative Plywood	06-11-2007
2.	9029574	M/s. Kanoria Chemicals & Industries Ltd. P.O. Renukoot, Distt: Sonbhadra, U.P.-231217	IS:632:1978 Gamma-bhc (indane) emulsifiable concentrates	18-10-2007
3.	9089188	M/s. K Sarbahi & Co. 29, Itki Mohalla, Nadan Mahal Road, Distt: Lucknow, UP-226004	IS 1971:1996 crop protection equipment -hand-operated stirrup-type sprayer	12-12-2007
4.	8305668	M/s. Geeta Home Appliances, Ekta Vihar Phase-III, Gas Godown Road, Kusum Khera, Haldwani, Distt. Nainital	IS 4246:2002 domestic gas stoves for use with liquefied petroleum gases	14-12-2007

[No. CMD/13:13]

A. K. TALWAR, Dy. Director General (Marks)

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 25 फरवरी, 2008 -

का. आ. 437.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन जारी, भारत के राजपत्र, तारीख 19-06-2007 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना का आ. संख्या 1862 तारीख 30-06-2007 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची तालुका-पलामानेर, जिल्ला चित्तूर, राज्य आन्ध्रप्रदेश केनै पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मनाली कि रिफ़ैनेरी से देवनगुडि टर्मिनल, बैंगलूर तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादनों के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी,

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियां ता. 23-07-07 से जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी ;
और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात यह समाधान हो गया है कि इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित किया जाए;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह घोषणा करती है कि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाय इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में सभी विल्लगनों से मुक्त होकर प्रकाशन की इस तारीख से निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

मंडल : पलामानेर		जिला : चित्तूर		राज्य : आन्ध्रप्रदेश	
गाँव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण सं- खण्ड सं.	उप-खण्ड सं.	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	एकर	वर्ग मिटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
73, पलामानेर	984	1	00	08	91
	731		00	05	26

[फा. सं. आर-25011/5/2007-ओ.आर.-1]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas

New Delhi, the 25th February, 2008

S. O. 437.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, S.O. 1862 dated 30-06-2007 under sub section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the schedule annexed to (Mandal Palamner, Dist. Chittoor, State Andhrapradesh) that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transportation of Petroleum Product from Refinery of Chennai Petroleum Corporation Limited, manali to Devanguthi Terminal, Bangalore, by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas, the copies of the said gazette notification were made available to the general public on date of 23-07-2007;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Central Government;

And whereas, the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied that right of user in the land specified in the schedule appended to this notification should be acquired.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule annexed to this notification is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby direct that the right of user in the said land shall instead of vesting the Central Government, vests from the date of the publication of this declaration in the Indian oil corporation limited free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Mandal : Palamaner		District : Chittoor		State : Andhra Pradesh		
Name of the Village	Survey No.	Sub-Division No.	Area			
			Hectare	Are	Sq. Mtr.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
73, PALAMANER	984	1	00	08	91	
	731		00	05	26	

[F. No. R-25011/5/2007-O.R.-I]
S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 25 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 438.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन जारी, भारत के राजपत्र, तारीख 19-06-2007 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्रकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना का आ. संख्या 1865 तारीख 30-06-2007 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची तालुका-बैरेडोपल्लि, जिल्ला चित्तूर, राज्य आन्ध्रप्रदेश चेन्नै पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मनाली कि रिफ़ाइनरी से देवनगुडि टॉर्मिनल, बैंगलूर तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी।

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियां ता. 23-07-07 से जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी ;
और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात यह समाधान हो गया है कि इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित किया जाए;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह घोषणा करती है कि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाय इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में सभी विल्लगनों से मुक्त होकर प्रकाशन की इस तारीख से निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

मंडल : बैरेडोपल्लि		जिला : चित्तूर		राज्य : आन्ध्रप्रदेश	
गाँव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण सं- खण्ड सं.	उप-खण्ड सं.	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	एकर	वर्ग मिटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
81, पेदाचिल्लारिगुटा	144	-	00	10	53
83, गोल्लाचीमनापल्लि	66	6	00	01	62
	66	4	00	02	83
	66	5	00	00	81
	65	5A	00	00	81
	65	5B	00	02	02
	65	2	00	02	83
	65	4A	00	00	40
	65	4B	00	00	40
	65	4C	00	00	40
	65	7	00	01	21
	65	3A	00	01	21
	65	3B	00	01	21
	14	1	00	03	24
	14	2	00	17	41
	71	-	00	24	29
	72	1	00	08	91
	72	2	00	01	62

1	2	3	4	5	6
84, आलापलि (क्रमः....)	274	1A	00	15	79
	271	2	00	01	62
	271	1	00	01	62
	254	-	00	08	91
	255	-	00	05	26
	261	2	00	08	91
	262	-	00	10	12
	269	2	00	06	88
	269	3	00	06	07
	257	-	00	04	86
	258	-	00	13	77
	249	2	00	00	81
	249	4	00	03	64
	209	1C	00	08	91
	209	1B	00	08	10
	146	1	00	02	83
	147	2	00	06	48
	147	1	00	00	40
	148	2	00	04	86
	148	3	00	02	02
	148	1	00	03	64
	143	1	00	03	24
	144	2	00	08	91
	144	1	00	00	40
	167	1	00	07	29
	167	3	00	05	67
	167	2	00	06	07
	163	1	00	03	24
	163	2	00	00	40
	168	-	00	00	40
	170	2	00	08	10
	170	3	00	00	81
	170	1	00	08	91
	28	1	00	14	57
	26	-	00	09	31
	27	1	00	06	07
	25	1	00	00	40
	7	-	00	14	17
	35	1	00	15	38
	35	2A	00	22	67
	36	1A	00	10	93
	36	1B	00	10	93
	172	-	00	10	12
	173	2	00	21	46
	5	-	00	12	15
	20	1B	00	08	10

[फा. सं. आर-25011/5/2007-ओ.आर.-I]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th February, 2008

S. O. 438.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India. Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas. S.O. 1865 dated 30-06-2007 under sub section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the schedule annexed to (Mandal Baireddypalli, Dist. Chittoor, State Andhrapradesh) that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transportation of Petroleum Product from Refinery of Chennai Petroleum Corporation Limited, manali to Devanguthi Terminal, Bangalore, by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas, the copies of the said gazette notification were made available to the general public on date of 23-07-2007;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Central Government;

And whereas, the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied that right of user in the land specified in the schedule appended to this notification should be acquired.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 6 of the said Act. the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule annexed to this notification is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act. the Central Government hereby direct that the right of user in the said land shall instead of vesting the Central Government, vests from the date of the publication of this declaration in the Indian oil corporation limited free from all encumbrances

SCHEDULE

Mandal : Baireddypalli		District : Chittoor		State : Andhra Pradesh		
Name of the Village	Survey No.	Sub-Division No.	Area			
			Hectare	Are	Sq. Mtr.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
81, PEDDACHELLARIGUNTA	144	-	00	10	53	
83, GOLLACHEEMANAPALLI	66	6	00	01	62	
	66	4	00	02	83	
	66	5	00	00	81	
	65	5A	00	00	81	
	65	5B	00	02	02	
	65	2	00	02	83	
	65	4A	00	00	40	
	65	4B	00	00	40	
	65	4C	00	00	40	
	65	7	00	01	21	
65	3A	00	01	21		

1	2	3	4	5	6
84, ALAPALLI (Continued...)	65	3B	00	01	21
	14.	1	00	03	24
	14	2	00	17	41
	71	-	00	24	29
	72	1	00	08	91
	72	2	00	01	62
	274	1A	00	15	79
	271	2	00	01	62
	271	1	00	01	62
	254	-	00	08	91
	255	-	00	05	26
	261	2	00	08	91
	262	-	00	10	12
	269	2	00	06	88
	269	3	00	06	07
	257	-	00	04	86
	258	-	00	13	77
	249	2	00	00	81
	249	4	00	03	64
	209	1C	00	08	91
	209	1B	00	08	10
	146	1	00	02	83
	147	2	00	06	48
	147	1	00	00	40
	148	2	00	04	86
	148	3	00	02	02
	148	1	00	03	64
	143	1	00	03	24
	144	2	00	08	91
	144	1	00	00	40
	167	1	00	07	29
	167	3	00	05	67
	167	2	00	06	07
	163	1	00	03	24
	163	2	00	00	40
	168	-	00	00	40
	170	2	00	08	10
	170	3	00	00	81
	170	1	00	08	91
	28	1	00	14	57
	26	-	00	09	31
	27	1	00	06	07
	25	1	00	00	40
	7	-	00	14	17
	35	1	00	15	38
	35	2A	00	22	67
	36	1A	00	10	93
	36	1B	00	10	93
	172	-	00	10	12
	173	2	00	21	46
	5	-	00	12	15
	20	1B	00	08	10

[F. No. R-25011/5/2007-O.R.-I]
S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 25 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 439.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन जारी, भारत के राजपत्र, तारीख 19-06-2007 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना का आ. संख्या 1866 तारीख 30-06-2007 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची तालुका-विजयपुरम, जिल्ला चित्तूर, राज्य आन्ध्रप्रदेश चेन्नै पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मनाली कि रिफ़ैनेरी से देवनगुट्टि टर्मिनल, बैंगलूर तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादनों के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी।

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियां ता. 23-07-07 से जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी ;
और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात यह समाधान हो गया है कि इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित किया जाए;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह घोषणा करती है कि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाय इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में सभी विल्लगनों से मुक्त होकर प्रकाशन की इस तारीख से निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

मंडल : विजयपुरम		जिला : चित्तूर		राज्य : आन्ध्रप्रदेश		
गाँव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण सं- खण्ड सं.	उप-खण्ड सं.	क्षेत्रफल			
			हेक्टर	एयर	वर्ग मिटर	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
28, श्रीहरिपुरम	153	1	00	20	65	
	157	1	00	56	68	
	152	12	00	16	19	
	152	3	00	04	86	
	149	15	00	07	69	
	149	14	00	05	26	
	149	12	00	01	62	
	149	8	00	04	05	
	149	7	00	07	29	
	150	5	00	03	24	
	136	3	00	04	45	
	136	4	00	05	26	
	136	13	00	05	26	
	136	14	00	04	05	
	135	3	00	13	77	
	133	18	00	04	86	
	133	20	00	02	83	
	124	4	00	01	62	
	124	1	00	02	02	
	125	23	00	07	29	
	125	26	00	02	02	
	125	27	00	01	21	

1	2	3	4	5	6
२४. अहि पुरम हारी (१००)	125	28	00	01	21
	120	15	00	02	02
	129	13	00	00	81
	121	1	00	06	48
	120	17	00	02	02
	136	1	00	02	02
29, महाराजपुरम	88	5	00	09	72
	89	-	00	02	43
	88	4	00	03	24
	82	7	00	14	57
	82	6	00	03	64
	79	5	00	12	96
	79	4	00	12	96
	47	4	00	14	98
	48	6	00	04	45
	48	4	00	04	05
	48	3	00	10	12
	50	5	00	19	43
	50	6	00	14	98
	50	2	00	04	45
	31	22	00	06	48
	32	15	00	04	05
	32	16	00	09	31
	37	18	00	02	43
	37	17	00	01	62
	37	16	00	02	43
	37	15	00	20	24
	37	12	00	03	64
	37	9	00	04	05
	37	8	00	04	86
	37	7	00	07	29
	37	2	00	03	24
	37	3	00	03	64
	37	4	00	01	62
	12	11	00	14	57
	12	8C	00	10	12
	12	7	00	05	67
	12	6	00	02	43
	12	5	00	00	81
	12	3	00	04	86
	16	6	00	04	45
	16	7	00	02	43
	16	8	00	02	02
	16	9	00	01	62
	16	3	00	05	67
	16	10	00	06	88
	16	11	00	03	24
32, पाथरकोड	101	27	00	00	81
	101	24	00	04	05
	101	23	00	06	88
	101	12	00	03	24
	101	4	00	14	98
	101	5	00	02	43
	101	6	00	00	81
	101	3B	00	01	62
	101	2	00	02	02
	100	11	00	02	43
	100	10	00	02	43
	100	13	00	00	81
	100	12	00	02	43
	98	14	00	06	07
	98	13	00	02	43

1	2	3	4	5	6
32, पञ्चअरकोड (क्रमसं:....)	98	7	00	02	43
	98	8	00	04	05
	98	9	00	00	81
	98	2	00	02	02
	98	3	00	02	43
	98	4	00	02	43
	204	12A	00	09	72
	204	13	00	02	02
	204	20	00	00	81
	204	21	00	05	26
	204	11	00	09	31
	204	24	00	02	83
	203	2	00	09	31
	203	6	00	12	15
	203	7	00	01	21
	233	10	00	07	29
	233	7	00	02	83
	233	8	00	03	24
	233	2	00	02	43
	233	4	00	02	02
	234	11	00	28	34
	239	4	00	01	21
	239	5	00	01	21
	239	10	00	04	05
	239	12	00	04	86
	241	2	00	24	29
	241	3	00	07	29
	247	9	00	01	21
	247	6	00	02	02
	247	3	00	02	02
	247	2	00	02	83
	247	8	00	02	02
	250	10	00	00	40
	250	11	00	00	40
	250	13	00	01	21
	250	14	00	02	02
	250	6	00	02	43
	250	4	00	02	43
	251	7B	00	20	24
	163	3	00	01	21
	163	4	00	05	26
	161	1	00	15	38
	156	1	00	10	53
	156	2	00	00	40
	156	6	00	05	26
	157	2	00	08	10
	157	3	00	12	15
	157	4	00	05	67
	153	2	00	07	29
	153	4	00	07	29
	153	5	00	10	93
	114	1, 2	00	30	77
	109	1	00	38	46
	97	37	00	02	43

[फा. सं. आर-25011/5/2007-ओ.आर.-1]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th February, 2008

S. O. 439.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India. Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas. S.O. 1866 dated 30-06-2007 under sub section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the schedule annexed to (Mandal Vijayapuram, Dist. Chittoor, State Andhrapradesh) that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transportation of Petroleum Product from Refinery of Chennai Petroleum Corporation Limited, manali to Devanguthi Terminal, Bangalore, by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited

And whereas, the copies of the said gazette notification were made available to the general public on date of 23-07-2007;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Central Government;

And whereas, the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied that right of user in the land specified in the schedule appended to this notification should be acquired.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 6 of the said Act. the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule annexed to this notification is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act. the Central Government hereby direct that the right of user in the said land shall instead of vesting the Central Government, vests from the date of the publication of this declaration in the Indian oil corporation limited free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Mandal : Vijayapuram		District : Chittoor		State : Andhra Pradesh		
Name of the Village	Survey No.	Sub-Division No.	Area			
			Hectare	Are	Sq. Mlr.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
28, SRIHARIPURAM	153	1	00	20	65	
	157	1	00	56	68	
	152	12	00	16	19	
	152	3	00	04	86	
	149	15	00	07	69	
	149	14	00	05	26	
	149	12	00	01	62	
	149	8	00	04	05	
	149	7	00	07	29	
	150	5	00	03	24	
	136	3	00	04	45	
	136	4	00	05	26	
	136	13	00	05	26	
	136	14	00	04	05	
	135	3	00	13	77	

1	2	3	4	5	6
28. SRIHARIPURAM (continued)	133	18	00	04	86
	133	20	00	02	83
	124	4	00	01	62
	124	1	00	02	02
	125	23	00	07	29
	125	26	00	02	02
	125	27	00	01	21
	125	28	00	01	21
	120	15	00	02	02
	129	13	00	00	81
	121	1	00	06	48
	120	17	00	02	02
	136	1	00	02	02
29. MAHARAJAPURAM	88	5	00	09	72
	89	-	00	02	43
	88	4	00	03	24
	82	7	00	14	57
	82	6	00	03	64
	79	5	00	12	96
	79	4	00	12	96
	47	4	00	14	98
	48	6	00	04	45
	48	4	00	04	05
	48	3	00	10	12
	50	5	00	19	43
	50	6	00	14	98
	50	2	00	04	45
	31	22	00	06	48
	32	15	00	04	05
	32	16	00	09	31
	37	18	00	02	43
	37	17	00	01	62
	37	16	00	02	43
	37	15	00	20	24
	37	12	00	03	64
	37	9	00	04	05
	37	8	00	04	86
	37	7	00	07	29
	37	2	00	03	24
	37	3	00	03	64
	37	4	00	01	62
	12	11	00	14	57
	12	8C	00	10	12
	12	7	00	05	67
	12	6	00	02	43
	12	5	00	00	81
	12	3	00	04	86
	16	6	00	04	45
	16	7	00	02	43
	16	8	00	02	02
	16	9	00	01	62
	16	3	00	05	67
	16	10	00	06	88
	16	11	00	03	24
32. PATHA ARCOD	101	27	00	00	81
	101	24	00	04	05
	101	23	00	06	88
	101	12	00	03	24
	101	4	00	14	98
	101	5	00	02	43
	101	6	00	00	81
	101	3B	00	01	62
	101	2	00	02	02
	100	11	00	02	43
	100	10	00	02	43

1	2	3	4	5	6
32, PATHA ARCOD (Continued...)	100	13	00	00	81
	100	12	00	02	43
	98	14	00	06	07
	98	13	00	02	43
	98	7	00	02	43
	98	8	00	04	05
	98	9	00	00	81
	98	2	00	02	02
	98	3	00	02	43
	98	4	00	02	43
	204	12A	00	09	72
	204	13	00	02	02
	204	20	00	00	81
	204	21	00	05	26
	204	11	00	09	31
	204	24	00	02	83
	203	2	00	09	31
	203	6	00	12	15
	203	7	00	01	21
	233	10	00	07	29
	233	7	00	02	83
	233	8	00	03	24
	233	2	00	02	43
	233	4	00	02	02
	234	11	00	28	34
	239	4	00	01	21
	239	5	00	01	21
	239	10	00	04	05
	239	12	00	04	86
	241	2	00	24	29
	241	3	00	07	29
	247	9	00	01	21
	247	6	00	02	02
	247	3	00	02	02
	247	2	00	02	83
	247	8	00	02	02
	250	10	00	00	40
	250	11	00	00	40
	250	13	00	01	21
	250	14	00	02	02
	250	6	00	02	43
	250	4	00	02	43
	251	7B	00	20	24
	163	3	00	01	21
	163	4	00	05	26
	161	1	00	15	38
	156	1	00	10	53
	156	2	00	00	40
	156	6	00	05	26
	157	2	00	08	10
	157	3	00	12	15
	157	4	00	05	67
	153	2	00	07	29
	153	4	00	07	29
	153	5	00	10	93
	114	1, 2	00	30	77
	109	1	00	38	46
	97	37	00	02	43

[F. No. R-25011/5/2007-O.R.-I]
S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 25 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 440.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन जारी, भारत के राजपत्र, तारीख 19-06-2007 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना का आ. संख्या 1867 तारीख 27-06-2007 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची तालुका-पालसमुद्रम, जिल्ला चित्तूर, राज्य आन्ध्रप्रदेश चैनै पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मनाली कि रिफ़ैनेरी से देवनगुडि टॉर्मिनल, बैंगलुर तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादनों के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी।

और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियां ता. 23-07-07 से जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी ;
और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात यह समाधान हो गया है कि इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूचि में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित किया जाए;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह घोषणा करती है कि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूचि में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाय इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में सभी विल्लगमों से मुक्त होकर प्रकाशन की इस तारीख से निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

मंडल : पालसमुद्रम		जिला : चित्तूर		राज्य : आन्ध्रप्रदेश	
गाँव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण सं- खण्ड सं.	उप-खण्ड सं.	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	एयर	वर्ग मिटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
46, क्रिष्णजम्मापुरम	53	4	00	15	38
	53	2D	00	07	69
	53	2B	00	17	81
	49	1	00	29	96
	27	6	00	11	74
	27	1	00	08	91
	27	2	00	02	83
	24	13	00	01	62
	24	14	00	02	43
	24	11	00	04	05
	24	10	00	01	21
	25	9	00	04	86
	25	8	00	02	02
	25	7	00	02	02
	25	6	00	04	05
	25	2	00	06	48
	25	3	00	04	05

1	2	3	4	5	6
47, श्रीकावेरिराजपुरम	167	1	00	19	43
	165	7	00	08	10
	165	5	00	06	88
	165	1	00	17	41
	162	3	00	08	91
	161	-	00	06	88
	160	3	00	08	91
	159	16	00	15	38
	159	2	00	01	62
	159	4	00	00	81
	159	5	00	01	21
	131	4	00	05	26
	131	5	00	06	48
	131	8	00	02	83
	131	6	00	06	07
	131	7	00	01	21
	130	5	00	14	17
	129	3	00	04	45
	129	1	00	11	74
	114	8	00	07	29
	114	9	00	01	62
	114	6	00	21	46
	114	1	00	01	21
	111	15	00	11	74
	111	10	00	07	69
	110	16	00	06	07
	110	17	00	02	02
	110	1	00	01	62
47, श्रीकावेरिराजपुरम (क्रमशः....)	110	13	00	12	96
	110	11	00	03	64
	90	9	00	17	81
	90	10	00	02	02
	90	14	00	02	83
	89	1	00	35	22
	41	1	00	20	24
	31	8	00	07	29
	31	6	00	09	31
	31	5	00	02	83
	31	4	00	00	81
	31	10	00	00	81
	159	1	00	03	64
	31	3	00	10	12
	32	1	00	18	22
	25	3	00	05	26
	25	2	00	13	36
	15	11	00	07	69
	15	10	00	06	07
	15	5	00	14	98
	14	10	00	04	86
	14	11	00	06	07
	14	12	00	05	67
	14	13	00	02	43
	114	4	00	03	24
	111	2	00	08	50
	90	19	00	00	40
	90	13	00	02	83
	41	3	00	02	02
	30	7	00	07	29
	30	6	00	10	93
	30	2	00	06	88
	30	1	00	01	21
	114	3	00	00	81

1	2	3	4	5	6
48, पालसमुद्रम	84	1	00	12	15
	80	1	00	18	62
	65	6	00	09	72
	73	16	00	10	53
	79	15	00	18	22
	79	3	00	01	21
	79	2C	00	03	64
	79	2B	00	10	53
	79	6	00	01	21
	76	4	00	26	32
	76	6	00	00	40
	76	7	00	01	21
	76	8	00	04	45
	28	3	00	09	31
	26	3B	00	15	79
	26	3D	00	10	93
	26	3A	00	12	15
	25	9B	00	02	43
	25	12	00	06	88
	25	11	00	00	40
	130	7	00	22	27
	130	6	00	10	12
	130	5	00	02	83
	139	3	00	06	48
	139	4	00	05	67
	139	5	00	02	02
	139	6	00	21	05
	140	13	00	01	21
	140	12	00	10	53
	140	10	00	06	07
	140	8	00	00	40
	140	7	00	00	40
	140	6	00	04	45
	140	5	00	03	24
	140	4	00	00	40
	140	3	00	00	40
	140	2	00	02	02
	141	16	00	00	81
	141	17	00	02	43
	144	8	00	22	27
	144	7	00	04	45
49, वेगलराजुकुप्पम	183	1E	00	14	98
	183	1F	00	14	98
	183	1A	00	14	98
	181	10A	00	12	15
	182	6	00	01	21
	182	5	00	00	40
	182	7	00	00	40
	182	3A	00	01	21
	182	3B	00	01	21
	182	2	00	00	81
	182	1A	00	04	86
	182	1B	00	04	86
	185	1	00	01	62
	185	3	00	01	21
	149	2	00	10	93
	149	3	00	01	62

1	2	3	4	5	6
49. वेगलराजकुप्पम (क्रमशः....)	149	4	00	05	67
	149	6	00	03	64
	149	7	00	07	69
	95	3	00	02	43
	95	4	00	01	21
	150	4A	00	02	83
	150	4B	00	02	83
	150	5	00	06	07
	150	6	00	06	48
	150	11	00	04	86
	150	12	00	05	67
	150	13	00	05	67
	192	4	00	00	40
	192	3	00	07	29
	192	8	00	00	40
	192	2	00	07	69
	192	9	00	10	93
	191	2	00	24	70
	191	7	00	03	24
	191	8	00	00	40
	191	9	00	00	40
	191	6	00	00	40
	191	10	00	04	86
	191	11	00	04	05
	186	2	00	00	40
	186	3	00	12	96
	186	5	00	14	57
	186	12	00	04	05
	186	14	00	01	21
	186	13	00	06	48
	148	6	00	09	72
	148	3E	00	02	43
	147	10A	00	02	02
	147	10B	00	02	02
	147	9	00	03	64
	147	8	00	00	40
	147	5	00	02	02
	147	6	00	05	26
	117	15	00	03	64
	117	14	00	05	67
	117	13A	00	03	64
	117	13B	00	03	64
	117	11	00	01	21
	117	10	00	06	88
	117	9	00	01	21
	117	7A	00	00	40
	117	7B	00	00	40
	117	8	00	02	43
	116	2	00	06	48
	115	3	00	07	40
	115	1A	00	08	50
	115	1B	00	08	50
	114	1B	00	17	41
	126	1A	00	09	31
	126	2	00	13	36
	125	1	00	00	40
	94	1B	00	12	15

1	2	3	4	5	6
49, वेगलराजकुप्यम (क्रमशः....)	94	1A	00	20	24
	96	13	00	00	81
	95	5	00	08	91
	95	1A	00	02	02
	95	2	00	01	62
	95	3	00	01	21
	95	4	00	01	21
	88	A	00	12	15
	88	B	00	10	53
	86	4	00	04	45
	86	1A	00	19	03
	86	6C	00	08	10
	85	F	00	23	08
	82	1	00	27	94
	55	2	00	14	17
	55	1	00	15	38
	51	7C	00	06	07
	51	3	00	03	24
	49	9	00	03	24
	49	8	00	02	02
	49	7A	00	00	81
	32	9B	00	01	21
	32	6A	00	02	02
	32	5	00	02	02
	32	4A	00	04	86
	32	2/B	00	10	12
	33	3A	00	13	36
	33	4	00	08	50
	33	9	00	06	07
	47	1A	00	18	62
	46	46-A	00	22	27
	44	-	00	04	05
50, अमुदला	264	18A	00	00	40
	264	19A	00	02	43
	264	19B, 19C	00	04	45
	264	14A	00	02	02
	264	14B	00	02	02
	264	13	00	08	50
	264	12	00	02	43
	263	17A	00	01	21
	263	8	00	01	21
	263	7	00	02	02
	263	15B	00	01	21
	263	9	00	01	62
	263	10	00	01	62
	263	6	00	00	81
	263	5	00	01	21
	263	4	00	00	40
	263	2	00	02	43
	263	3	00	02	43

1	2	3	4	5	6
50, अमुदला (क्रमशः....)	262	2	00	00	40
	262	3	00	02	83
	262	4	00	02	43
	262	1	00	07	69
	251	14	00	02	83
	251	13	00	04	45
	251	5	00	00	81
	251	6	00	01	21
	251	7	00	00	81
	251	2	00	03	24
	251	1A	00	04	05
	251	11	00	02	43
	243	20	00	14	17
	243	19	00	08	10
	247	13D	00	03	24
	248	1	00	14	17
	246	10	00	08	10
	246	9	00	12	15
	250	6	00	04	45
	250	3	00	10	12
	225	1	00	23	48
	225	2A	00	10	93
	195	2	00	12	15
	195	1	00	10	12
	188	E	00	06	48
	188	I	00	06	48
	188	L	00	06	48
	188	C	00	12	96
	188	A	00	06	48
	188	K	00	06	48
	188	B	00	06	48
	188	F	00	06	48
	188	H	00	06	48
	160	2A	00	05	26
	160	2B	00	05	26
	160	2C	00	05	26
	160	2D	00	05	26
	160	2E	00	05	26
	160	2F	00	06	07
	160	1A	00	06	88
	160	1C	00	07	69
	160	1B	00	05	67
	160	1D	00	04	86
	161	A	00	03	24
	161	B	00	03	24
	161	C	00	03	24
	161	D	00	03	24
	161	E	00	03	24
	161	F	00	03	24
	163	2A	00	03	24

1	2	3	4	5	6
50, अमुदला (क्रमशः....)	163	2B	00	03	24
	163	2C	00	03	24
	163	2D	00	03	24
	163	2E	00	03	24
	163	2F	00	03	24
	164	1A	00	06	48
	164	1B	00	06	48
	164	2	00	26	32
	147	-	00	33	20
	148	2	00	02	83
	148	1	00	22	67
	136	12B	00	07	29
	136	12A	00	07	29
	136	12C	00	07	29
	136	10	00	03	24
	136	11	00	01	21
	136	6	00	01	21
	136	7B	00	01	62
	136	7C	00	01	62
	136	5	00	02	83
	136	4	00	00	40
	136	3	00	00	81
	136	2	00	02	83
	136	1	00	10	12
	33	16	00	08	50
	33	15	00	07	69
	33	14	00	02	43
	33	13	00	12	96
	33	12	00	10	93
	33	8	00	14	57
	33	7	00	03	64
	33	6	00	02	02
	33	5A	00	05	26
	33	5B	00	05	26
	32	7	00	04	45
	32	8	00	17	00
	32	6A	00	02	83
	32	6B	00	02	83
	32	4	00	04	45
	32	3	00	02	83
	32	1	00	03	24
	30	1A	00	20	65
51, अमिदुला पुत्तुर	95	9	00	08	91
	95	8	00	01	21
	96	9	00	03	64
	98	16C	00	02	83
	98	12	00	09	31
	98	17	00	04	86
	98	11	00	03	24
	98	10	00	01	21

1	2	3	4	5	6
51, अमिदुला पुत्तुर (क्रमशः...)	98	9	00	02	83
	99	18	00	08	10
	99	17	00	00	40
	99	12	00	02	43
	99	11	00	00	81
	99	6	00	02	43
	99	4	00	02	02
	99	5	00	00	40
	99	1	00	02	02
	102	7	00	04	45
	102	6	00	00	81
	102	8	00	05	67
	102	1	00	06	07
	103	11	00	11	74
	103	6	00	01	62
	103	4	00	02	02
	103	3	00	01	21
	101	3	00	02	02
	104	15	00	05	26
	104	4	00	04	86
	104	5	00	04	05
	104	3	00	07	29
	106	11	00	04	05
	106	10	00	04	05
	106	6	00	04	86
	106	7	00	01	21
	106	8	00	03	64
	107	7	00	06	88
	107	6	00	03	64
	107	4	00	00	40
	107	3	00	17	00
	107	5	00	03	64

[फा. सं. आर-25011/5/2007-ओ.आर.-1]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th February, 2008

S. O. 440.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India. Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas. S.O. 1867 dated 30-06-2007 under sub section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the schedule annexed to (Mandal Palasamudram, Dist. Chittoor, State Andhrapradesh) that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transportation of Petroleum Product from Refinery of Chennai Petroleum Corporation Limited, manali to Devanguthi Terminal, Bangalore, by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas, the copies of the said gazette notification were made available to the general public on date of 23-07-2007;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Central Government;

And whereas, the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied that right of user in the land specified in the schedule appended to this notification should be acquired.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 6 of the said Act. the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule annexed to this notification is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act. the Central Government hereby direct that the right of user in the said land shall instead of vesting the Central Government, vests from the date of the publication of this declaration in the Indian oil corporation limited free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Mandal : Palasamudram		District : Chittoor		State : Andhra Pradesh	
Name of the Village	Survey No.	Sub-Division No.	Area		
			Hectare	Are	Sq. Mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6
46, KRISHNAJAMMAPURAM	53	4	00	15	38
	53	2D	00	07	69
	53	2B	00	17	81
	49	1	00	29	96
	27	6	00	11	74
	27	1	00	08	91
	27	2	00	02	83
	24	13	00	01	62
	24	14	00	02	43
	24	11	00	04	05
	24	10	00	01	21
	25	9	00	04	86
	25	8	00	02	02
	25	7	00	02	02
	25	6	00	04	05
	25	2	00	06	48
	25	3	00	04	05
47, SRIKAVERIRAJUPURAM	167	1	00	19	43
	165	7	00	08	10
	165	5	00	06	88
	165	1	00	17	41
	162	3	00	08	91
	161	-	00	06	88
	160	3	00	08	91
	159	16	00	15	38
	159	2	00	01	62
	159	4	00	00	81
	159	5	00	01	21
	131	4	00	05	26
	131	5	00	06	48
	131	8	00	02	83
	131	6	00	06	07
	131	7	00	01	21
	130	5	00	14	17
129	3	00	04	45	

1	2	3	4	5	6
47, SRIKAVERIRAJUPURAM	129	1	00	11	74
(Continued...)	114	8	00	07	29
	114	9	00	01	62
	114	6	00	21	46
	114	1	00	01	21
	111	15	00	11	74
	111	10	00	07	69
	110	16	00	06	07
	110	17	00	02	02
	110	1	00	01	62
	110	13	00	12	96
	110	11	00	03	64
	90	9	00	17	81
	90	10	00	02	02
	90	14	00	02	83
	89	1	00	35	22
	41	1	00	20	24
	31	8	00	07	29
	31	6	00	09	31
	31	5	00	02	83
	31	4	00	00	81
	159	10	00	00	81
	31	1	00	03	64
	32	3	00	10	12
	25	1	00	18	22
	25	3	00	05	26
	25	2	00	13	36
	15	11	00	07	69
	15	10	00	06	07
	15	5	00	14	98
	14	10	00	04	86
	14	11	00	06	07
	14	12	00	05	67
	14	13	00	02	43
	114	4	00	03	24
	111	2	00	08	50
	90	19	00	00	40
	90	13	00	02	83
	41	3	00	02	02
	30	7	00	07	29
	30	6	00	10	93
	30	2	00	06	88
	30	1	00	01	21
	114	3	00	00	81
48, PALASAMUDRAM	84	1	00	12	15
	80	1	00	18	62
	85	6	00	09	72
	73	16	00	10	53
	79	15	00	18	22
	79	3	00	01	21
	79	2C	00	03	64
	79	2B	00	10	53
	79	6	00	01	21
	76	4	00	26	32
	76	6	00	00	40
	76	7	00	01	21
	76	8	00	04	45

1	2	3	4	5	6
48, PALASAMUDRAM	28	3	00	09	31
(Continued...)	26	3B	00	15	79
	26	3D	00	10	93
	26	3A	00	12	15
	25	9B	00	02	43
	25	12	00	06	88
	25	11	00	00	40
	130	7	00	22	27
	130	6	00	10	12
	130	5	00	02	83
	139	3	00	06	48
	139	4	00	05	67
	139	5	00	02	02
	139	6	00	21	05
	140	13	00	01	21
	140	12	00	10	53
	140	10	00	06	07
	140	8	00	00	40
	140	7	00	00	40
	140	6	00	04	45
	140	5	00	03	24
	140	4	00	00	40
	140	3	00	00	40
	140	2	00	02	02
	141	16	00	00	81
	141	17	00	02	43
	144	8	00	22	27
	144	7	00	04	45
49, VENGALRAJUKUPPAM	183	1E	00	14	98
	183	1F	00	14	98
	183	1A	00	14	98
	181	10A	00	12	15
	182	6	00	01	21
	182	5	00	00	40
	182	7	00	00	40
	182	3A	00	01	21
	182	3B	00	01	21
	182	2	00	00	81
	182	1A	00	04	86
	182	1B	00	04	86
	185	1	00	01	62
	185	3	00	01	21
	149	2	00	10	93
	149	3	00	01	62
	149	4	00	05	67
	149	6	00	03	64
	149	7	00	07	69
	95	3	00	02	43
	95	4	00	01	21
	150	4A	00	02	83

1	2	3	4	5	6
49, VENGALRAJUKUPPAM	150	4B	00	02	83
(Continued...)	150	5	00	06	07
	150	6	00	06	48
	150	11	00	04	86
	150	12	00	05	37
	150	13	00	05	67
	192	4	00	00	40
	192	3	00	07	29
	192	8	00	00	40
	192	2	00	07	69
	192	9	00	10	93
	191	2	00	24	70
	191	7	00	03	24
	191	8	00	00	40
	191	9	00	00	40
	191	6	00	00	40
	191	10	00	04	86
	191	11	00	04	05
	186	2	00	00	40
	186	3	00	12	96
	186	5	00	14	57
	186	12	00	04	05
	186	14	00	01	21
	186	13	00	06	48
	148	6	00	09	72
	148	3E	00	02	43
	147	10A	00	02	02
	147	10B	00	02	02
	147	9	00	03	64
	147	8	00	00	40
	147	5	00	02	02
	147	6	00	05	26
	117	15	00	03	64
	117	14	00	05	67
	117	13A	00	03	64
	117	13B	00	03	64
	117	11	00	01	21
	117	10	00	06	88
	117	9	00	01	21
	117	7A	00	00	40
	117	7B	00	00	40
	117	8	00	02	43
	116	2	00	06	48
	115	3	00	07	70
	115	1A	00	08	50
	115	1B	00	08	50
	114	1B	00	17	41
	126	1A	00	09	31
	126	2	00	13	36
	125	1	00	00	40
	94	1B	00	12	15

1	2	3	4	5	6
49, VENGALRAJUKUPPAM (Continued...)	94	1A	00	20	24
	96	13	00	00	81
	95	5	00	08	91
	95	1A	00	02	02
	95	2	00	01	62
	95	3	00	01	21
	95	4	00	01	21
	88	A	00	12	15
	88	B	00	10	53
	86	4	00	04	45
	86	1A	00	19	03
	86	6C	00	08	10
	85	F	00	23	08
	82	1	00	27	94
	55	2	00	14	17
	55	1	00	15	38
	51	7C	00	06	07
	51	3	00	03	24
	49	9	00	03	24
	49	8	00	02	02
	49	7A	00	00	81
	32	9B	00	01	21
	32	6A	00	02	02
	32	5	00	02	02
	32	4A	00	04	86
	32	2/B	00	10	12
	33	3A	00	13	36
	33	4	00	08	50
	33	9	00	06	07
	47	1A	00	18	62
	46	46-A	00	22	27
	44	-	00	04	05
50, AMUDALA	264	18A	00	00	40
	264	19A	00	02	43
	264	19B, 19C	00	04	45
	264	14A	00	02	02
	264	14B	00	02	02
	264	13	00	08	50
	264	12	00	02	43
	263	17A	00	01	21
	263	8	00	01	21
	263	7	00	02	02
	263	15B	00	01	21
	263	9	00	01	62
	263	10	00	01	62
	263	6	00	00	81
	263	5	00	01	21
	263	4	00	00	40
	263	2	00	02	43
	263	3	00	02	43

1	2	3	4	5	6
50, AMUDALA (Continued...)	262	2	00	00	40
	262	3	00	02	83
	262	4	00	02	43
	262	1	00	07	69
	251	14	00	02	83
	251	13	00	04	45
	251	5	00	00	81
	251	6	00	01	21
	251	7	00	00	81
	251	2	00	03	24
	251	1A	00	04	05
	251	11	00	02	43
	243	20	00	14	17
	243	19	00	08	10
	247	13D	00	03	24
	248	1	00	14	17
	246	10	00	08	10
	246	9	00	12	15
	250	6	00	04	45
	250	3	00	10	12
	225	1	00	23	48
	225	2A	00	10	93
	195	2	00	12	15
	195	1	00	10	12
	188	E	00	06	48
	188	I	00	06	48
	188	L	00	06	48
	188	C	00	12	96
	188	A	00	06	48
	188	K	00	06	48
	188	B	00	06	48
	188	F	00	06	48
	188	H	00	06	48
	160	2A	00	05	26
	160	2B	00	05	26
	160	2C	00	05	26
	160	2D	00	05	26
	160	2E	00	05	26
	160	2F	00	06	07
	160	1A	00	06	88
	160	1C	00	07	69
	160	1B	00	05	67
	160	1D	00	04	86
	161	A	00	03	24
	161	B	00	03	24
	161	C	00	03	24
	161	D	00	03	24
	161	E	00	03	24
	161	F	00	03	24
	163	2A	00	03	24

1	2	3	4	5	6
50, AMUDALA (Continued...)	163	2B	00	03	24
	163	2C	00	03	24
	163	2D	00	03	24
	163	2E	00	03	24
	163	2F	00	03	24
	164	1A	00	06	48
	164	1B	00	06	48
	164	2	00	26	32
	147	-	00	33	20
	148	2	00	02	83
	148	1	00	22	67
	136	12B	00	07	29
	136	12A	00	07	29
	136	12C	00	07	29
	136	10	00	03	24
	136	11	00	01	21
	136	6	00	01	21
	136	7B	00	01	62
	136	7C	00	01	62
	136	5	00	02	83
	136	4	00	00	40
	136	3	00	00	81
	136	2	00	02	83
	136	1	00	10	12
	33	16	00	08	50
	33	15	00	07	69
	33	14	00	02	43
	33	13	00	12	96
	33	12	00	10	93
	33	8	00	14	57
	33	7	00	03	64
	33	6	00	02	02
	33	5A	00	05	26
	33	5B	00	05	26
	32	7	00	04	45
	32	8	00	17	00
	32	6A	00	02	83
	32	6B	00	02	83
	32	4	00	04	45
	32	3	00	02	83
	32	1	00	03	24
	30	1A	00	20	65
51, AMUDALA PUTTUR	95	9	00	08	91
	95	8	00	01	21
	96	9	00	03	64
	98	16C	00	02	83
	98	12	00	09	31
	98	17	00	04	86
	98	11	00	03	24
	98	10	00	01	21

1	2	3	4	5	6
51, AMUNALA PUTTUR	98	9	00	02	83
(Continued...)	99	18	00	08	10
	99	17	00	00	40
	99	12	00	02	43
	99	11	00	00	81
	99	6	00	02	43
	99	4	00	02	02
	99	5	00	00	40
	99	1	00	02	02
	102	7	00	04	45
	102	6	00	00	81
	102	8	00	05	67
	102	1	00	06	07
	103	11	00	11	74
	103	6	00	01	62
	103	4	00	02	02
	103	3	00	01	21
	101	3	00	02	02
	104	15	00	05	26
	104	4	00	04	86
	104	5	00	04	05
	104	3	00	07	29
	106	41	00	04	05
	106	10	00	04	05
	106	6	00	04	86
	106	7	00	01	21
	106	8	00	03	64
	107	7	00	06	88
	107	6	00	03	64
	107	4	00	00	40
	107	3	00	17	00
	107	5	00	03	64

[F. No. R-25011/5/2007-O.R.-I]
S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 25 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 441.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन जारी, भारत के राजपत्र, तारीख 19-06-2007 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना का आ. संख्या 1868 तारीख 30-06-2007 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची तालुका-गंगाधरनेल्लोर, जिल्ला चित्तूर, राज्य आन्ध्रप्रदेश के पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मनाली कि रिफ़ेनेरी से देवनगुडि टॉर्मिनल, बैंगलूर तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादनों के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी। और उक्त राजपत्र अधिसूचना की प्रतियां ता. 23-07-07 से जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी ; और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात यह समाधान हो गया है कि इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित किया जाए;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह घोषणा करती है कि पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाय इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में सभी विल्लगमों से मुक्त होकर प्रकाशन की इस तारीख से निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

मंडल : गंगाधरनेल्लोर		जिला : चित्तूर		राज्य : आन्ध्रप्रदेश	
गाँव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण सं- खण्ड सं.	ठप-खण्ड सं.	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	एयर	वर्ग मिटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
52, बुण्डम	390	14	00	00	81
	390	15	00	04	05
	390	16	00	03	64
	390	17	00	04	86
	390	18	00	00	81
	385	1	00	01	21
	385	2	00	04	05
	385	3	00	02	43
	385	4	00	02	83
	385	5	00	03	24
	385	6	00	07	29
	387	1	00	04	45
	387	2	00	02	02
	387	3	00	02	43
	387	5	00	13	36
	387	4	00	00	81
	389	7	00	10	12
	389	8	00	00	40
	389	9	00	12	55
	374	20	00	05	67
	374	21	00	03	24
	374	22	00	04	05
	374	23	00	02	83
	374	27	00	02	83
	374	28	00	03	24
	375	1	00	02	83
	375	2	00	04	05
	375	3	00	00	81
	375	4	00	01	21
	375	5	00	01	62
	375	23B	00	02	43
	375	24	00	03	64
	373	3	00	02	02
	373	4	00	04	05
	373	5	00	04	45
	373	11	00	01	21
	376	16	00	08	10
	376	18A	00	04	05
	376	18B	00	04	05
	371	1B	00	05	26
	371	2B	00	05	26
	371	3	00	05	26
	371	4	00	04	86
	371	5A	00	01	62
	370	3A	00	04	86

1	2	3	4	5	6
52, बुगुदम (क्रमशः...)	370	3B	00	04	45
	370	3C	00	04	86
	370	4	00	03	24
	370	5	00	00	40
	370	6A	00	08	10
	370	9	00	01	21
	308	1B	00	03	24
	308	2	00	01	62
	308	3	00	02	02
	308	4	00	02	02
	308	5	00	02	02
	308	11	00	01	21
	308	13	00	10	12
	308	14	00	02	83
	308	18	00	06	07
	308	19	00	02	43
	312	2	00	02	83
	312	3	00	03	24
	312	4	00	02	02
	312	5	00	01	62
	312	7	00	00	81
	312	13	00	07	29
	312	14	00	04	45
	313	4A	00	00	81
	313	4B	00	00	81
	313	5	00	03	64
	313	6	00	05	26
	313	16	00	00	81
	313	18A	00	00	81
	313	7	00	01	62
	313	8B	00	07	29
	313	9A	00	02	02
	321	2B	00	12	15
	319	3	00	05	67
	319	4	00	04	05
	319	5	00	02	02
	319	8	00	02	43
	319	8	00	01	21
	319	12	00	04	05
	319	13	00	01	62
	319	9	00	00	81
	319	11	00	00	40
	323	5A	00	06	88
	323	5B	00	07	29
	279	9	00	04	45
	279	20	00	00	81
	281	1	00	14	17
	281	5	00	14	17
	285	1	00	09	31
	285	7	00	08	91
	285	8	00	00	81

1	2	3	4	5	6
82, बुद्धिम (क्रमः....)	285	13	00	00	81
	286	1	00	10	12
	288	2	00	01	62
	288	3	00	01	62
	286	7	00	00	40
	266	8	00	01	62
	286	16	00	01	21
	286	17	00	01	21
	286	18	00	09	31
	286	22	00	00	40
	296	3	00	02	43
	296	4	00	01	62
	296	5	00	01	62
	296	7	00	01	62
	296	8	00	01	21
	296	9	00	00	40
	296	10	00	01	21
	296	11	00	00	81
	296	12	00	02	02
	297	1	00	06	07
	297	5	00	02	02
	297	8	00	12	15
	298	1	00	04	05
	298	2A	00	16	19
	298	2C	00	05	67
	198	15B	00	16	19
	200	3	00	18	22
	200	4	00	02	02
	200	6	00	03	64
	200	9	00	08	91
	200	10	00	02	43
	202	2	00	05	67
	203	24	00	07	29
	204	3	00	08	91
	204	4	00	07	29
	204	5	00	00	40
	204	16	00	05	26
	204	17	00	00	40
	204	13	00	08	10
	204	14	00	00	40
	205	1A	00	04	05
	205	1B	00	03	64
	205	1C	00	03	64
	205	1D	00	03	24
	205	2	00	02	83
	242	4	00	04	45
	228	1	00	02	43
	228	2	00	12	15
	229	1	00	13	77
	231	1	00	07	29
	231	2	00	12	55

1	2	3	4	5	6
52, बुन्देल (क्रमशः....)	231	3	00	01	62
	231	12	00	01	21
	231	15A	00	12	15
	231	17	00	08	91
	239	3	00	08	91
	241	4	00	04	45
	241	5	00	02	43
	241	6A	00	11	74
	213	1	00	13	36
	213	2A	00	04	45
	213	2B	00	04	45
	213	2C	00	04	45
53, अम्बोदरापल्ले	132	1	00	29	15
	132	2A	00	01	62
	132	3	00	04	86
	129	2A	00	00	40
	130	16	00	05	26
	130	15	00	04	86
	130	14	00	10	12
	130	13	00	00	81
	130	17	00	08	10
	124	1	00	06	88
	124	2	00	03	64
	123	2D	00	00	40
	123	8A	00	02	02
	123	8B	00	03	64
	113	1	00	11	34
	113	4A	00	00	40
	117	13	00	09	72
	117	14B	00	00	81
	117	16	00	03	64
	117	17	00	06	48
	115	1A	00	08	10
	115	2	00	00	81
	115	1B	00	01	62
	115	1C	00	01	21
	59	-	00	24	29
	61	2A	00	05	26
	61	2B	00	05	67
	61	3	00	08	91
	61	4	00	10	12
	287	1	00	18	62
	287	2	00	04	05
	286	2F	00	05	67
	286	2H	00	04	05
	285	2	00	18	22
	285	3	00	11	34
	264	2	00	12	15
	264	3	00	14	98
	94	5	00	01	21

1	2	3	4	5	6
53, अम्बोदरापल्ली (क्रमसं:....)	95	4	00	08	50
	95	11	00	52	63
	95	12	00	24	70
	95	13	00	01	62
54, एल्लापेल्ले	85	1	00	04	05
	85	2	00	04	05
	85	6	00	00	81
	86	1	00	16	19
	86	2	00	01	62
	84	6	00	09	31
	84	5	00	04	86
	84	4	00	06	48
	84	3	00	05	26
	84	2	00	07	29
	84	1B	00	01	62
	90	12	00	12	15
	90	11	00	02	43
	90	10	00	12	15
	91	22	00	08	10
	91	21	00	00	40
	92	3	00	00	40
	92	2	00	16	19
	92	1	00	06	07
	22	4A	00	00	81
	22	4B	00	00	40
	22	3	00	00	81
	22	5B	00	01	62
	22	5C	00	05	67
	22	7	00	06	88
	22	6	00	00	81
	20	12	00	04	86
	20	13	00	01	21
	20	11	00	04	45
	20	10	00	00	40
	20	5	00	01	21
	20	4B	00	03	64
	20	6	00	02	43
	20	4A	00	00	40
	20	9	00	00	81
	20	8	00	01	62
	20	7	00	01	62
	19	7	00	09	31
	19	6	00	01	21
	19	2	00	07	69
	19	1	00	00	40
	16	6	00	05	26
	16	4	00	04	86
	16	2	00	05	26
	16	3	00	26	32
	15	2	00	18	62

[फा. सं. आर-25011/5/2007-ओ.आर.-1]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th February, 2008

S. O. 441.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India. Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas. S.O. 1868 dated 30-06-2007 under sub section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the schedule annexed to (Mandal Gangadharanellore, Dist. Chittoor, State Andhrapradesh) that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transportation of Petroleum Product from Refinery of Chennai Petroleum Corporation Limited, manali to Devanguthi Terminal, Bangalore, by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas, the copies of the said gazette notification were made available to the general public on date of 23-07-2007;

And whereas the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Central Government;

And whereas, the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied that right of user in the land specified in the schedule appended to this notification should be acquired.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 6 of the said Act. the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule annexed to this notification is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline.

And further in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act. the Central Government hereby direct that the right of user in the said land shall instead of vesting the Central Government, vests from the date of the publication of this declaration in the Indian oil corporation limited free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Mandal : Gangadharanellore		District : Chittoor		State : Andhra Pradesh		
Name of the Village	Survey No.	Sub-Division No.	Area			
			Hectare	Are	Sq. Mtr.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
52, THUGUNDRAM	390	14	00	00	81	
	390	15	00	04	05	
	390	16	00	03	64	
	390	17	00	04	86	
	390	18	00	00	81	
	385	1	00	01	21	
	385	2	00	04	05	
	385	3	00	02	43	
	385	4	00	02	83	
	385	5	00	03	24	
	385	6	00	07	29	
	387	1	00	04	45	

1	2	3	4	5	6
52, THUGUNDRAM	387	2	00	02	02
(Continued...)	387	3	00	02	43
	387	5	00	13	36
	387	4	00	00	81
	389	7	00	10	12
	389	8	00	00	40
	389	9	00	12	55
	374	20	00	05	67
	374	21	00	03	24
	374	22	00	04	05
	374	23	00	02	83
	374	27	00	02	83
	374	28	00	03	24
	375	1	00	02	83
	375	2	00	04	05
	375	3	00	00	81
	375	4	00	01	21
	375	5	00	01	62
	375	23B	00	02	43
	375	24	00	03	64
	373	3	00	02	02
	373	4	00	04	05
	373	5	00	04	45
	373	11	00	01	21
	376	16	00	08	10
	376	18A	00	04	05
	376	18B	00	04	05
	371	1B	00	05	26
	371	2B	00	05	26
	371	3	00	05	26
	371	4	00	04	86
	371	5A	00	01	62
	370	3A	00	04	86
	370	3B	00	04	45
	370	3C	00	04	86
	370	4	00	03	24
	370	5	00	00	40
	370	6A	00	08	10
	370	9	00	01	21
	308	1B	00	03	24
	308	2	00	01	62
	308	3	00	02	02
	308	4	00	02	02
	308	5	00	02	02
	308	11	00	01	21
	308	13	00	10	12
	308	14	00	02	83
	308	18	00	06	07
	308	19	00	02	43
	312	2	00	02	83
	312	3	00	03	24
	312	4	00	02	02
	312	5	00	01	62
	312	7	00	00	81
	312	13	00	07	29
	312	14	00	04	45
	313	4A	00	00	81
	313	4B	00	00	81
	313	5	00	03	64
	313	6	00	05	26
	313	16	00	00	81

1	2	3	4	5	6
62, THUGUNDRAM	313	18A	00	00	81
(Continued...)	313	7	00	01	62
	313	8B	00	07	29
	313	9A	00	02	02
	321	2B	00	12	15
	319	3	00	05	67
	319	4	00	04	05
	319	5	00	02	02
	319	6	00	02	43
	319	8	00	01	21
	319	12	00	04	05
	319	13	00	01	62
	319	9	00	00	81
	319	11	00	00	40
	323	5A	00	06	88
	323	5B	00	07	29
	279	9	00	04	45
	279	20	00	00	81
	281	1	00	14	17
	281	5	00	14	17
	285	1	00	09	31
	285	7	00	08	91
	285	8	00	00	81
	285	13	00	00	81
	286	1	00	10	12
	286	2	00	01	62
	286	3	00	01	62
	286	7	00	00	40
	286	8	00	01	62
	286	16	00	01	21
	286	17	00	01	21
	286	18	00	09	31
	286	22	00	00	40
	296	3	00	02	43
	296	4	00	01	62
	296	5	00	01	62
	296	7	00	01	62
	296	8	00	01	21
	296	9	00	00	40
	296	10	00	01	21
	296	11	00	00	81
	296	12	00	02	02
	297	1	00	06	07
	297	5	00	02	02
	297	8	00	12	15
	298	1	00	04	05
	298	2A	00	16	19
	298	2C	00	05	67
	198	15B	00	16	19
	200	3	00	18	22
	200	4	00	02	02
	200	6	00	03	64
	200	9	00	08	91
	200	10	00	02	43
	202	2	00	05	67
	203	24	00	07	29
	204	3	00	08	91
	204	4	00	07	29
	204	5	00	00	40
	204	16	00	05	26

1	2	3	4	5	6
52, THUGUNDRAM	204	17	00	00	40
(Continued...)	204	13	00	08	10
	204	14	00	00	40
	205	1A	00	04	05
	205	1B	00	03	64
	205	1C	00	03	64
	205	1D	00	03	24
	205	2	00	02	83
	242	4	00	04	45
	228	1	00	02	43
	228	2	00	12	15
	229	1	00	13	77
	231	1	00	07	29
	231	2	00	12	55
	231	3	00	01	62
	231	12	00	01	21
	231	15A	00	12	15
	231	17	00	08	91
	239	3	00	08	91
	241	4	00	04	45
	241	5	00	02	43
	241	6A	00	11	74
	213	1	00	13	36
	213	2A	00	04	45
	213	2B	00	04	45
	213	2C	00	04	45
53, AMBODARAPALLE	132	1	00	29	15
	132	2A	00	01	62
	132	3	00	04	85
	129	2A	00	00	40
	130	16	00	05	26
	130	15	00	04	86
	130	14	00	10	12
	130	13	00	00	81
	130	17	00	08	10
	124	1	00	06	88
	124	2	00	03	64
	123	2D	00	00	40
	123	8A	00	02	02
	123	8B	00	03	64
	113	1	00	11	34
	113	4A	00	00	40
	117	13	00	09	72
	117	14B	00	00	81
	117	16	00	03	64
	117	17	00	06	48
	115	1A	00	08	10
	115	2	00	00	81
	115	1B	00	01	62
	115	1C	00	01	21
	59	-	00	24	29
	61	2A	00	05	26
	61	2B	00	05	67
	61	3	00	08	91
	61	4	00	10	12
	287	1	00	18	62
	287	2	00	04	05
	286	2F	00	05	67

1	2	3	4	5	6
53, AMBODARAPALLE	286	2H	00	04	05
(Continued...)	285	2	00	18	22
	285	3	00	11	34
	284	2	00	12	15
	284	3	00	14	98
	94	5	00	01	21
	95	4	00	08	50
	95	11	00	52	63
	95	12	00	24	70
	95	13	00	01	62
54, ELLAPELLE	85	1	00	04	05
	85	2	00	04	05
	85	6	00	00	81
	86	1	00	16	19
	86	2	00	01	62
	84	6	00	09	31
	84	5	00	04	86
	84	4	00	06	48
	84	3	00	05	26
	84	2	00	07	29
	84	1B	00	01	62
	90	12	00	12	15
	90	11	00	02	43
	90	10	00	12	15
	91	22	00	08	10
	91	21	00	00	40
	92	3	00	00	40
	92	2	00	16	19
	92	1	00	06	07
	22	4A	00	00	81
	22	4B	00	00	40
	22	3	00	00	81
	22	5B	00	01	62
	22	5C	00	05	67
	22	7	00	06	88
	22	6	00	00	81
	20	12	00	04	86
	20	13	00	01	21
	20	11	00	04	45
	20	10	00	00	40
	20	5	00	01	21
	20	4B	00	03	64
	20	6	00	02	43
	20	4A	00	00	40
	20	9	00	00	81
	20	8	00	01	62
	20	7	00	01	62
	19	7	00	09	31
	19	6	00	01	21
	19	2	00	07	69
	19	1	00	00	40
	16	6	00	05	26
	16	4	00	04	86
	16	2	00	05	26
	16	3	00	26	32
	15	2	00	18	62

[F. No. R-25011/5/2007-O.R.-I]
S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 26 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 442.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप- धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय के भारत के राजपत्र, तारीख 06-10-2007 में प्रकाशित अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 2936 तारीख 04-10-2007, पृष्ठ 8569 से 8613 पर प्रकाशित (हिन्दी भाग) में निम्नलिखित रूप से संशोधन करती है, अर्थात:-

1. पृष्ठ संख्या 8582, गांव 33 आरुंगुलम, स्तम्भ 2 (सर्वेक्षण सं०- खण्ड सं०) में पंक्ति 23 से 34, "312" के स्थान पर "372" पढ़ा जाए।
2. पृष्ठ संख्या 8584, गांव "25 थालावेडु" के स्थान पर "33 आरुंगुलम" पढ़ा जाए।
3. पृष्ठ संख्या 8584, पंक्ति 11 स्तम्भ 1 में (स्तम्भ-2 में सं० 262 के सामने) गांव का नाम "25 थालावेडु" पढ़ा जाए।
4. पृष्ठ संख्या 8585, गांव 14 आलामेलुमांगापुरम, स्तम्भ 3 (उप खण्ड सं०) में पंक्ति 38 में, "3बी " के स्थान पर "3सी " पढ़ा जाए।

[फा. सं. आर-25011/11/2007-ओ.आर.-I]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th February, 2008

S. O. 442.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas published in the Gazette of India dated 06.10.2007 Part II – Section 3, Sub-section (ii) vide S.O. No. 2936 dated 04.10.2007 at pages 8569 to 8613 namely –

1. At page 8605 in village 33 Arungulam, in column 2 (Survey No.), in line nos. 1 to 12 for '312' read '372'
2. At page 8606 in village 25 Thalavedu, in column 2 (Survey No.), in line no. 38 for '26' read '263'
3. At page 8609 in village 12 Krishnasamudram, in column 3 (Sub-Division No.) in line no. 51 for 'SF' read 'SF'

[F. No. R-25011/11/2007-O.R.-I]

S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 26 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 443.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (क) के अनुसरण में, नीचे दी गई अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 1 में उल्लिखित व्यक्तियों को, उक्त अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (2) में की गई तत्स्थानी प्रविष्टि में उल्लिखित क्षेत्र के संबंध में, उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन सक्षम प्राधिकारी के कृत्यों का पालन करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है

अनुसूची

क्र.सं.	सक्षम प्राधिकारी का नाम और पता	अधिकारिता का क्षेत्र
1.	श्री सुबोध दत्ता बेहेरा, उप प्रबंधक, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, पारादीप हल्दिया क्रूड पाइपलाइन परियोजना, 486 (प्रथम तल), बिजयचन्द्रपुर, पारादीप, जिला जगतसिंहपुर - 754142 (उड़ीसा)	उड़ीसा राज्य

[फा. सं. आर-25011/10/2006-ओ.आर.-1]

एस. के. चिटकारा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th February, 2008

S. O. 443.—In pursuance of clause (a) of Section 2 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby authorize the person mentioned in column (1) of the Schedule below to perform the functions of the Competent Authority under the provisions of the said Act, within the areas mentioned in the corresponding entry in column (2) of the said Schedule.

Schedule

S.No.	Name & Address of the Competent Authority	Areas of Jurisdiction
1.	Shri Subodha Datta Behera, Deputy Manager, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Paradip Haldia Crude Pipeline Project, 486(1 st Floor) Bijoychandrapur, Paradip, Distt.-Jagatsinghpur-754 142 (Orissa).	Orissa State

[F. No. R-25011/10/2006-O.R.-1]
S.K. CHITKARA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 27 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 444.—भारत सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में जगोटी-पीथमपुर पाइपलाइन परियोजना के माध्यम से प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड द्वारा, एक पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और भारत सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में, जिसमें उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णीत है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध कर दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के संबंध में सक्षम प्राधिकारी, गेल (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड, नानाखेड़ा, सनवर रोड, उज्जैन - 456 010 को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

जगोटी-पीथमपुर आर-एल.एन.जी. पाइपलाइन परियोजना

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	ग्राम	सर्वे नंबर	सर्वे नम्बर का वह क्षेत्रफल जिसमें आरओयू अध्यापित किया जाना है (हेक्टेयर में)
इंदौर	सांवेर	पवार्दा-जुर्नादा	251/2	0.10
			कुल	0.10
	सांवेर	उगमखेड़ी	17/1/1	0.09
			17/3	0.02
			कुल	0.11
	सांवेर	कुडाना	818/1 & 818/2	0.03
			1048/1	0.35
			कुल	0.38
	सांवेर	रावेर	188/430/2	0.06
			393/2/1	0.10
			कुल	0.16
	इंदौर	बुढानिया	393/2	0.06
			कुल	0.06

	इंदौर	जम्बूडी हवसी	138	0.04
			139	0.03
			कुल	0.07
	इंदौर	कलारिया	115/1	0.19
			115/2	0.17
			कुल	0.36
	देपालपुर	ओसरोद	14/1	0.09
			14/3	0.07
			14/2	0.08
			कुल	0.24
देवास	देवास	बरोठ पिपल्या	297	0.01
			298	0.01
			333	0.12
			337	0.04
			कुल	0.18
उज्जैन	महिदपुर	जगोटी	1523/1	0.04
			कुल	0.04

[फा. सं. एल-14014/1/2008-जी. पी.]

के. के. शर्मा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 27th February, 2008

S. O. 444.—Whereas it appears to Government of India that it is necessary in the public interest that for transportation of natural gas through Jagoti – Pithampur R-LNG Pipeline Project in the State of Madhya Pradesh, a pipeline should be laid by GAIL (India) Limited;

And, whereas it appears to Government of India that for the purpose of laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which is described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act 1962 (50 of 1962), Government of India hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of the notification issued under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the said Act, as published in the Gazette of India are made available to the general public, object in writing to the laying of the pipeline under the land to Competent Authority, GAIL (India) Limited, Nanakeda, Sanwar Road, Ujjain – 456 010 (Madhya Pradesh).

**JAGOTI – PITHAMPUR R-LNG PIPELINE PROJECT
SCHEDULE**

District	Tahsil	Village	Survey No.	Area to be acquired for R.O.U. (In Hectare)
Indore	Sawer	Pawarda-Junarda	251/2	0.10
			Total	0.10
	Sawer	UgamKhedi	17/1/1	0.09
			17/3	0.02
			Total	0.11
	Sawer	Kudana	818/1 & 818/2	0.03
			1048/1	0.35
			Total	0.38
	Sawer	Rawer	188/430/2	0.06
			393/2/1	0.10
			Total	0.16
	Indore	Budhaniya	393/2	0.06
			Total	0.06
	Indore	Jambudi Havsi	138	0.04
			139	0.03
			Total	0.07
	Indore	Kalariya	115/1	0.19
			115/2	0.17
			Total	0.36
	Depaipur	Osrod	14/1	0.09
			14/3	0.07
			14/2	0.08
			Total	0.24
Dewas	Dewas	Baroth Pipliya	297	0.01
			298	0.01
			333	0.12
			337	0.04
			Total	0.18
Ujjain	Mahidpur	Jagoti	1523/1	0.04
			Total	0.04

[F. No. L-14014/1/2008-G.P.]
K. K. SHARMA, Under Secy.

श्रम और रोजगार प्रशासन

नई दिल्ली, 6 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 445.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस.सी.सी.एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध निोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 74/88) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 6-2-2008 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22013/1/2008-आईआर(सी-II)]

अजय कुमार गौड़, डेस्क अधिकारी

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 6th February, 2008

S.O. 445.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 74/88) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. SCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 06-02-2008.

[No. L-22013/1/2008-IR(C-II)]

AJAY KUMAR GAUR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE EMPLOYEES INSURANCE COURT, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-I, HYDERABAD****PRESENT:**

Sri T. Anand, M.A. LL.B.,

Judge (FAC)

Dated this the 11th day of December, 2007

I.D. No. 74/1988

BETWEEN:

M. Mallaiah,
Ex. Coal Cutter, Godavari Khani,
Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd.,
10-Incline, Karimnagar District. Petitioner

AND

The Singareni Collieries Company Ltd.,
Godavarikhani, Ramagundam Area,
Karimnagar District,
Rep. by its Director, Godavari Khani,
Karimnagar District. Respondent

This Industrial Dispute is coming on before me for final hearing on 7-11-07, upon perusing the petition, counter and other material papers on record and upon hearing the arguments of Sri V. Srinivas, Advocate for the petitioner and Sri PAVV Sharma, Advocate for the respondent and the matter having stood over

for consideration, till this date, this court passed the following:—

AWARD

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, vide its order dt. 26-2-1988 referred the following dispute under Section 10(1)(d) and 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the management of Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd. (Projects), Godavarikhani and their workmen to this Tribunal for adjudication:

"Whether the action of the management of Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd. (Projects), Godavarikhani in dismissing from service Sri Naspuri Mallaiah, Ex. Coal Cutter w.e.f. 1-10-1982 was justified? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled?"

2. This reference was registered as I.D. 74/1988 and notices were issued to both the parties.

3. The brief contents of the claim statement reads as follows:

The petitioner was appointed on 3-2-1977 and made permanent as Coal Cutter on 2-11-1978 vide proceedings GDK 9A/79/86, dt. 17-8-1980 by the respondent. The petitioner was discharging his duties without any compliance whatsoever to the satisfaction of the respondent. While, so a charge sheet dt. 9-10-1981 was issued to the petitioner making certain false allegations. Though the petitioner submitted explanation, the respondent failed to consider the same and directed the petitioner to appear for enquiry. The enquiry officer violated all the principles of natural justice and did not give reasonable opportunity to the petitioner during the enquiry. The enquiry was conducted in English in spite of protest by the petitioner. The list of witnesses and list of documents were not furnished to the petitioner. The service of the petitioner was terminated by an order dt. 29-9-1982. The same charges were framed in Criminal Case by the Criminal Court and ultimately Judicial First Class Magistrate, Sultanabad by judgement dt. 11-1-1984 in C.C. No. 398/1982, acquitted him. The termination order was not passed by competent authority. Hence the termination order is illegal. The punishment is highly excessive and disproportionate. The domestic enquiry itself is invalid and vitiated. Hence it is prayed to direct the respondent to reinstate the petitioner with full backwages and other attendant benefits.

4. The respondent filed counter contending as follows:

It is admitted that the petitioner was appointed in the respondent company on 3-2-1977 and was made

permanent Coal Cutter on 2-11-1987 itself. It is denied that the petitioner was discharging duties without any complaint. It is admitted that the petitioner was issued charge sheet on 9-10-1981. The petitioner submitted explanation after receiving charge sheet, but the explanation was not satisfactory and so one Sri G. Chander Rao was appointed as an enquiry officer to conduct domestic enquiry. It is denied that the enquiry officer violated all the principles of natural justice during the enquiry. The petitioner never made any representation before the enquiry officer to conduct the enquiry in Telugu. On the other hand the petitioner submitted explanation in English. In fact the enquiry was conducted in Telugu but the recording was done in English. After recording was over the enquiry proceedings were read over to the petitioner and were explained to him in Telugu and only after being satisfied he signed on the proceedings. The petitioner never asked for supply of list of documents during the enquiry. The entire proceedings before the enquiry officer was conducted in the presence of the petitioner. The petitioner also cross-examined the management representations. Thus full opportunity was given to the petitioner during the enquiry. In case this Court comes to the conclusion that the enquiry was not conducted as per principles of natural justice, the respondent may be permitted to prove the charges before this Court to justify the orders passed on 29-9-1982. The petitioner is called upon to prove that charges framed in the Criminal Court and the charges levelled against him during the domestic enquiry are one and the same. The scope of domestic enquiry is totally different from that of criminal cases. As such the criminal judgement is not binding on the respondent management. The charges are grave in nature as the petitioner assaulted two officers namely L.K. Das, the then Deputy Chief Mining Engineer and Sri Talpallikar, the then Chief Mining Engineer and his Driver and also damaged two cars and one lorry. The officers who were assaulted have given evidence in the domestic enquiry. It is not correct to say the punishment is highly excessive and disproportionate to the charge levelled against the petitioner. The domestic enquiry is not invalid. None of the recognized unions espoused the cause of the petitioner, since they are aware that the petitioner committed grave offence. The petitioner had chosen to raise the dispute 7 years after his dismissal from service. Hence the petitioner's claim is stale claim, which cannot be entertained by the Court. It is, therefore prayed to dismiss the Industrial Dispute.

5. During the enquiry, the petitioner examined himself as W.W.-1 and no documents are marked. On

behalf of the management MW-1 to MW-3 were examined and Ex. M-1 to Ex. M-3 were marked.

6. On 12-8-1993 one of my predecessors passed an order to the effect that the domestic enquiry conducted by the management is vitiated. Subsequently Award was passed in this case on 16-4-1994. Aggrieved by this award, the management preferred W.P. No. 15415/96. The Hon'ble High Court remitted the matter to this Court with a direction for reconsideration on the basis of evidence let in before it and for passing of award after hearing both the parties within a period of two months.

7. As per the above order of the Hon'ble High Court this Court was directed to consider the evidence let in by both sides.

8. Heard both sides.

9. The point for consideration is :

"Whether the action of the management of Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd. (Projects), Godavarikhani in dismissing from service Sri Naspuri Mallaiah, Ex. Coal Cutter w.e.f. 1-10-1982 was justified?

If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled?"

10. Since it was held that the domestic enquiry is vitiated, it is for the management to show that the enquiry was conducted in accordance with the Law after following principles of natural justice. Towards this end 3 witnesses were examined on management side.

11. MW-1 the Deputy Personnel Manager on respondent company deposed that he was appointed as enquiry officer to conduct domestic enquiry against the petitioner for his misconduct. Ex. M-1 is the charge sheet dt. 1-10-1981, wherein six charges were levelled against the petitioner, which are as follows :

- (i) On 25-9-1981 at about 3.15 P.M. you stopped company's Car No. API 1592 on the road near GDK 7. Incline Chummeries, pulled out Sri Raman Pillai, Driver on duty of that car and assaulted him without any reason causing injuries.
- (ii) When Sri V.B. Talpallikar, DS, OC. who was travelling by this Car No. API 1592 came out and requested you not to assault the driver, you turned against him and assaulted him shouting that the management was not taking any action against the Drivers who were causing injuries to the workers.
- (iii) Again on the same date i.e., 25-9-1981 within few minutes, i.e. about 3.25 P.M. you also stopped company's Car No. APR 2073 by which Sri L.K. Das, S.E. GDK. 9. Incline was

travelling, you tried to pull Sri Das out of the car by catching his shirt and by attempting to open the door of the car by force.

- (iv) You have also broken the front and rear glasses of the car No. API 1592, which belongs to the company and in which Sri Talpallikar was travelling. The damage of the car was estimated to the extent of Rs. 2,500.
- (v) You have also damaged Car No. APR 2073 by which Sri Das was travelling by pulling out the door and banging it and was removing the handle. This damage is to the extent of Rs. 200.
- (vi) Further, one company's lorry, which was new and was for registration was also stopped at that spot by you and you broke the front glasses of this lorry of the company. This damage is to the extent of Rs. 1500.

Ex. M-2 is the explanation given by the petitioner 13-10-1981 as per which he was stated that he requested to drop action against him as proposed in the chargesheet till the finalization of the criminal case pending on the file of Munsif Magistrate, Sultanabad. Ex. M-3 is the termination order dt. 29-9-1982 as per which the petitioner services were terminated.

12. In the cross-examination of M.W.-1 it was elicited that M.W.-1 did not mention in Ex. M-9 (marked in domestic enquiry) that he was appointed as enquiry officer as per the order in Ex. M-1 (marked in domestic enquiry). He also did not issue any enquiry notice at any time to the petitioner calling upon him to attend the enquiry. However it is denied that the enquiry was conducted as per the instructions and directions of the management. He denied that the petitioner was not given proper and fair opportunity to defend his case in the domestic enquiry.

13. M.W.-2, retired Addl. Chief Mining Engineer of the respondent company, deposed that while he was proceeding in a car from Stores to his work spot at 3 P.M. he saw mob and also noticed car of Mr. L.K. Das who is an officer in the respondent company. M.W.-2 asked Mr. L.K. Das what was the matter. He said there is nothing serious and small altercation took place between the Driver and workers. Then some people stopped the car of M.W.-2 and pulled the Driver out of the car and started beating him. When M.W.-2 came out of the car to rescue the Driver, he also received two or three blows in his stomach. His shirt and pant were torn. M.W.-2 stated that he had no enmity with the workman i.e. the petitioner. M.W.-2 did not give evidence in the criminal case. He does not know what happened to the criminal case. According to M.W.-2 windscreen and front and back

portion of the car were damaged. He identified the petitioner as one of the culprits among the five or six people who were arrested by the police.

14. M.W.-3 who is employed in the respondent company also deposed to the fact that he witnessed the incident on 25-9-1991 at about 3.15 P.M. while he was standing on the road waiting for a lorry. He observed a mob of 30 or 40 workmen coming from Venkatarao Palli to GDK 7 incline. The mob shouted loudly and tried to stop the lorry, which was passing on the road in high speed. There after another car came behind the lorry. Then mob came and broke the glasses and dragged M.W.-2 from the car and beat him. Another car in which Mr. L.K. Das was sitting also came when the incident occurred. They also tried to stop the said car but the Driver took deviation and drove the carry away from the mob. In the cross-examination M.W.-3 stated that except Mallaiah and Butchaiah, he could not recognize any other person from the mob.

15. On the basis of the above evidence the counsel for the management contended that the petitioner has committed grave offence of beating official and damaging the car and the same is proved in the domestic enquiry and therefore the termination order terminating the services of the petitioner is legally valid and question of reinstating the petitioner into service does not arise.

16. The petitioner was examined as W.W.-1, who deposed that the enquiry is not in accordance with the known principles of natural justice. He denied the alleged incident took place on 25-9-1981. He admitted his thumb impression on Ex. M-3 (marked in domestic enquiry). Ex. M-3 contents are in English. He admitted signature in Ex. M-5 (marked in domestic enquiry) and also admitted the contents in Ex. M-5 are true. Likewise he admitted Ex. M-6 (marked in domestic enquiry). He admitted that the enquiry officer explained the procedure of enquiry to him. He only complained that he does not know what was written in enquiry proceedings. According to W.W.-1 Mr. L.K. Das gave evidence in criminal case but he died in Godavarikhani. Admittedly he did not protest against conducting enquiry in English. About the incident W.W.-1 deposed that on that day he along with D. Buchaiah observed a big gathering on the road and people started running here and there. A police jeep also came to the spot and they were enquired by the police. Police took them in the jeep without allowing them to say anything. Thereafter they were produced in the Court and were remanded to judicial custody. According to him no identification parade was conducted by the police either in the police station or in the office of the respondent. He says that the criminal case ended in acquittal ultimately. M.W.-2 did not give any evidence before the Criminal Court. One Mr. Raman Pillai gave evidence in the criminal court stating that W.W.-1 did not beat M.W.-2. As per the

evidence of W.W.-1 there is no enmity between himself and Talpallikar i.e. M.W.-2.

17. The contention of the counsel for the petitioner is that the charges levelled against him in the charge memo and the charges in the Criminal Court are one and the same and that when the criminal case ended in acquittal, the disciplinary proceedings initiated against the petitioner ought to have been stopped. It is contended that the termination of service of the petitioner is quite unwarranted and management acted in mala fide manner to victimize him.

18. The counsel for the respondent placed reliance on several decisions, which are mentioned in the written arguments. In 2006(10) Supreme Court cases 572, it is held that "This Court has taken the view consistently that acquittal in a criminal case would be no bar for drawing up a disciplinary proceedings against the delinquent officer. It is a well settled principle of law that the yard stick and standard of proof in a criminal case is different from the disciplinary proceedings. While the standard of proof in a criminal case is a proof beyond all reasonable doubt, the proof in departmental proceedings is preponderance of probabilities."

19. Another decision reported in 2006(1) Supreme Court Cases 430, it held that "It is well established principle in law that in a given circumstance it is open to the Industrial Tribunal acting under Section 11-A of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, has the jurisdiction to interfere with the punishment awarded in the domestic enquiry for good and availed reasons.

If the Tribunal decides to interfere with such punishment, it should bear in mind the principle of proportionality between the gravity of offence and stringency of the punishment.

In the instant case it is the finding of the Tribunal, which is not disturbed by the Writ Courts, that the two workmen involved in the appeal along with others formed themselves into an unlawful assembly, armed with deadly weapons, went to the Office of the General Manager, and assaulted him and his colleagues causing them injuries.

The injuries suffered by the General Manager were caused by lathi on the head.

The fact that the victim did not die is not a mitigating circumstances to reduced the sentence of dismissal. Law declared by this Court under Article 141 of the Constitution, categorically demonstrates that the Tribunal would not normally interfere with the quantum of punishment imposed by the Employers unless an appropriate case is made out therefore."

20. Basing on the above said decisions it is contended by the respondent counsel that the petitioner has failed to produce the judgment of the Criminal Court

to prove that he was acquitted of all the charges levelled against him. It is also contended that unless judgment is produced it cannot be said that the allegations in the charge framed by the Criminal Court are one and the same and based on the same set of facts.

21. The counsel for the petitioner placed reliance on a judgment rendered in W.A. No. 1100/2005 in support of his contention that when there was Hon'ble acquittal of the employee during the pendency of proceedings, challenging the dismissal, the same request is taken note of by the enquiry officer conducting departmental enquiry.

22. The Hon'ble High Court placed reliance on Paul Anthony's case reported in 2005(8) SC 425. In the said decision the Hon'ble Supreme Court considered the question whether the departmental proceedings and criminal proceedings launched on the basis of the same set of facts can be continued simultaneously. The Hon'ble Supreme Court culled out the following propositions :—

- (i) Departmental proceedings and proceedings in a criminal case can proceed simultaneously as there is no bar in their being conducted simultaneously, though separately.
- (ii) If the departmental proceedings and the criminal case are based on identical and similar set of facts and the charge in the criminal case against the delinquent employee is of a grave nature, which involves complicated questions of law and fact, it would be desirable to stay the departmental proceedings till the conclusion of the criminal case.
- (iii) Whether the nature of a charge in a criminal case is grave and whether complicated questions of fact and law are involved in that case, will depend upon the nature of offence, the nature of the case launched against the employee on the basis of evidence and material collected against him during investigation or as reflected in the charge sheet.
- (iv) The factors mentioned at (ii) and (iii) above cannot be considered in isolation to stay the departmental proceedings but due regard has to be given to the fact that the departmental proceedings cannot be unduly delayed.
- (v) If the criminal case does not proceed or its disposal is being unduly delayed, the departmental proceedings, even if they were stayed on account of the pendency of the criminal case, can be resumed and proceeded with so as to conclude them at an early date, so that if the employee is found not guilty his

honour may be vindicated and in case he is found guilty, administration may get rid of him at the earliest."

23. Basing on the principles laid down in Captain Paul Anthony's case the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Appeal held that the finding of the Presiding Officer of the Tribunal overlooking the acquittal recorded by VI Additional Metropolitan Sessions Judge, is contrary to Law laid down by the Supreme Court and therefore the judgment of Single Judge quashing the Award passed by the Tribunal was held to be correct.

24. The counsel for the respondent contended that this judgment cannot be applied to the facts of the present case on hand, since the petitioner failed to produce the Criminal Court judgment.

25. I have gone through the evidence on record. The witnesses have categorically stated that the petitioner was among the mob and beat MW-2. The admissions of the petitioner would show that he participated in the domestic enquiry without any protest. The documentary evidence show that from time to time the petitioner asked for adjournment which was accepted by the enquiry officer. So it cannot be said that the enquiry officer has not at all given any opportunity to the petitioner to put forth his case in the domestic enquiry. In order to rely upon the judgment of Hon'ble High Court rendered in W.A. No. 1100/2005, the petitioner should have filed certified copy of judgment of Criminal Court to show that he was acquitted honorably. It is well settled Law that the trial of criminal case and disciplinary proceedings can go on simultaneously and that acquittal in criminal case will, by itself, not operate as a bar to the holding of the disciplinary proceedings. This Court is not in a position to know whether the petitioner was acquitted honorably, as the petitioner failed to file the copy of the Criminal Court judgment. The evidence on record clearly established that the petitioner and some other persons assaulted M W-2 and damaged the car. The eyewitness account is also corroborating the evidence of MW-2, who was assaulted by the petitioner and some others. So it cannot be said that the petitioner was not in the mob and assaulted M.W.-2. Beating, assaulting and damaging the property of the respondent is a grave offence as rightly contended by the respondent counsel. It is also to be noted that the petitioner raised the dispute almost 7 years after the termination order was passed. Hence I hold that the claim of the petitioner is a stale claim. Hence in view of my aforesaid discussion, I hold that the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. And the action of the management of Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., (Projects), Godavarikhani in dismissing from service Sri Naspuri Mallaiah, Ex. Coal Cutter w.e.f. 1-10-1982 was justified.

26. In the result Award is passed holding that the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. Accordingly the

termination order dt. 1-10-1982 held to be valid. The Industrial Dispute is dismissed. The reference is answered accordingly.

Dictated to the stenographer, transcribed by her, corrected by me and pronounced in the Open Court on 11th day of December, 2007.

T. ANAND, Chairman

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE

Witnesses examined for the Management

MW 1 : G. Chandra Rao

MW 2 : B.V. Talpallikar

MW 3 : N. Shiva Rami Reddy

Witnesses examined for the Workman

WW 1 : N. Mallaiah

Documents marked for the Management

Ex. M1 : Charge sheet issued to the workman Sri N. Mallaiah.

Ex-M2 : Explanation given by the workman Sri. N. Mallaiah.

Ex.-M3 : Dismissal Order issued by the Additional Chief Training Engineer Ramagundam Division-IV to Sri N. Mallaiah.

Documents marked for the workman

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 7 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 446.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मै. बी.सी.सी.एल. के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (सं.-11), धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 6/2006) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 7-2-08 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/150/2005-आईआर(सी-1)]

स्नेह लता जवास, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 7th February, 2008

S.O. 446.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 6/2006) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. II), Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 07-02-2008.

[No. L-20012/150/2005-IR(C-I)]
SNEH LATA JAWAS, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE
BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD
PRESENT

Shri Nagendra Kumar, Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section
 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

Reference No. 6 of 2006

Parties : Employers in relation to the
 Management of Kusunda Area of
 M/s. B.C.C.L. and their workman

Appearances :

On behalf of the workman : None

On behalf of the employers : Mr. U.N. Lal, Advocate

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dated, Dhanbad, the 22nd January, 2008

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/150/2005-I.R. (C-1), dated the 23rd January, 2006.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of the Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union from the management of BCCL, Kusunda Area that Sh. Bulak Mahato may be regularised as Trammer justified? If so, to what relief is the workman entitled and from what date?"

2. In this reference neither the concerned workman nor his representative appeared before this Tribunal. Management side however, made appearance through their authorised representative. It appears from the record that Regd. notice and show cause notice were issued to the workman/sponsoring union. It also further appears from the record that the workman/sponsoring union have not only failed to comply with the provision of Rule 10(B) of the I.D. (Central) Rules, 1957 but also even did not consider necessary to respond to the notices issued by this Tribunal. Gesture of the workmen/sponsoring union it is taken into consideration will expose clearly that they are not interested to proceed with the hearing of this case. Under such circumstances, this Tribunal finds no ground to adjourn the case suo moto for days together. Hence, the case is closed and a 'No dispute' Award is passed in this reference presuming non-existence of any industrial dispute between the parties.

NAGENDRA KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 7 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 447.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने. बी.सी.सी.एल.

के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (सं.-II), धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 1/2006) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 7-2-08 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/118/2005-आईआर(सी-1)]

स्नेह लता जावास, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 7th February, 2008

S.O. 447.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 1/2006) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. II), Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 07-02-2008.

[No. L-20012/118/2005-IR(C-1)]

SNEH LATA JAWAS, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD
PRESENT

Shri Nagendra Kumar, Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section
 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

Reference No. 1 of 2006

Parties : Employers in relation to the
 Management of Sijua Area of
 M/s. B.C.C.L. and their workman.

Appearances :

On behalf of the workman : None

On behalf of the employers : Mr. R.N. Ganguly,
 Advocate

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dated, Dhanbad, the 22nd January, 2008

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/118/2005-I.R. (C-1), dated, the 12th January, 2006.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Kankanee Colliery of M/s. BCCL in dismissing Sri Shankar Bhuia, M/Loader from the services of the

company vide letter dated 25-8-2004 is fair and justified ? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled ?”

2. In this reference neither the concerned workman nor his representative made appearance before this Tribunal. Management side however, appeared through their authorised representative. From the record it appears that Regd. notice and show cause notice were issued to the workman/sponsoring union. It also further transpires from the record that the workman/sponsoring union have not only failed to comply with the provision of Rule 10(B) of the I.D. (Central) Rules, 1957 but also even did not consider necessary to respond to the notices issued by this Tribunal. Gesture of the workman/sponsoring union - it is taken into consideration it will expose clearly that they are not interested to proceed with the hearing of this case. Under such circumstances, this Tribunal finds no reason to adjourn the case suo moto for months together. Hence, the case is closed and a 'No dispute' Award is passed in this reference presuming non-existence of any industrial dispute between the parties.

NAGENDRA KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 448.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार तूतीकोरीन पोर्ट ट्रस्ट के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 47/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 8-2-2008 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-44011/1/2007-आईआर(बी-II)]

राजिन्द्र कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 11th February, 2008

S.O. 448.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 47/2007) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Tuticorin Port Trust and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 08-02-2008.

[No. L-44011/1/2007-IR(B-II)]

RAJINDER KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Thursday, the 29th November, 2007

PRESENT

Shri K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 47/2007

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of Tuticorin Port Trust and their Workmen)

Between :

The General Secretary : Petitioner/I Party
Tuticorin Port Mariners and
General Staff Union
Beach Road,
Tuticorin-628001

Vs.

The Chairman : Respondent/II Party
Tuticorin Port Trust
Tuticorin

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : None
For the Management : S. Yashwanth

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-44011/1/2007/IR(B-II) dated 23-08-2007 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication. The schedule mentioned in that order :

“Whether the claim of Tuticorin Port Mariners and General Staff Union for an increment as FR 22 of Sri R. Kesavan, Loco Driver even after allowing two advance increments as per the Anamoly Committee report against the management of Tuticorin Port Trust, Tuticorin is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman/union is entitled ?”

2. After the receipt of Industrial Dispute, this Tribunal has numbered it as ID 47/2007 and issued notices. After the notice, the second Respondent appeared through their advocate whereas the petitioner has not appeared before this Tribunal nor anybody represented the petitioner. As such, the Respondent has filed a Memo of Objection.

Points for determination are :

- (i) Whether the claim of the petitioner union for an increment as per FR-22 to Sri R. Kesavan, Loco Driver against the Respondent Management is legal and justified ?
- (ii) To what relief the concerned workmen is entitled ?

Point Nos. (i) & (ii)

3. As I have already stated even after two notices, the petitioner union has not appeared before this Tribunal nor filed any claim statement. The Respondent

Management has filed a Memo of Objection, the allegation in that Memo of Objection are :

The dispute is with regard to fixation of pay in respect of promotion to the post of Loco Driver Special Grade-I from the feeder category. In that the petitioner union insisted for fixation of pay from the promotional post of date of next increment from the date of feeder category i.e. in the lower grade of Loco Driver and not from the date of promotional post of Loco Driver Special Grade being the same timescale of pay for both the categories. The Respondent Management examined the case and it was not acceptable to it and therefore it rejected the claim of the union. The union has raised the dispute with the labour authorities and after the conciliation has been failed, the matter was referred to this Tribunal. The Respondent in his memo further contended since the petitioner has not appeared before Court or filed his claim statement, it should be presumed that he has no valid case to establish his claim and therefore the claim of the petitioner is to be rejected.

4. I find some force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. In this case, though two notices have been served upon the petitioner union, the petitioner union has not appeared before the Court nor filed any claim statement and he has been set ex parte. Since the burden of establishing the claim is upon the petitioner union and since the petition union has not come forward with their case with satisfactory evidence, I find the petitioner is not entitled to get any relief in this I.D.

5. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 9th November, 2007).

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :

For the I Party/Petitioner : None

For the II Party/Management : None

Documents Marked :

From the Petitioner's side

Ex. No.	Date	Description
	NIL	

From the Management side :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
	NIL	

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 449.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसार में, केन्द्रीय सरकार आईओसीएल, नई दिल्ली एवं मै. विजय रतन-इंटरप्राइजेज, नई दिल्ली के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/ग्राम न्यायालय II, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (संदर्भ आई डी सं. 34/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11-2-2008 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30011/30/2007-आईआर(एम.)]

एन.एस. बोर, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 11th February, 2008

S.O. 449.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. I.D. No. 34/2007) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court II, New Delhi now as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of IOCL, New Delhi & M/s. Vijaya Rattan Enterprises, New Delhi and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 11-2-2008.

[No. L-30011/30/2007-IR(M)]

N.S. BORA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II, NEW DELHI

R.N. Rai, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 34/2007

In the matter of :

Shri Babu Lal Mandal, ... Claimant
Petroleum Mazdoor Union,
C/o CPWD Worker's Union,
Sector-IV, R.K. Puram,
New Delhi-110022

Versus

1. The Sr. Plant Manager,
IOCL, LPG Bottling Plant,
Madanpur Khadar,
New Delhi
2. M/s. Vijaya Rattan Enterprises, ... Respondents
445/1, 446/3, Karkardooma,
Opp. Post Office, Vikas Marg,
New Delhi

AWARD

The Ministry of Labour by its letter No. L-30011/30/2007 IR(M) Central Government Dt. 26-07-2007 has referred the following point for adjudication:

The point runs as hereunder :

"Whether the termination of the workmen in May, 2005 by M/s. Vijay Rattan Enterprises, 445/446/3, Karkardooma, Vikas Marg, Delhi, contractor of IOCL LPG Bottling Plant, Madanpur Khadar, New Delhi is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled.

This reference was received on 13-08-2007. Despite several dates the workmen have not filed claim statement. No dispute has been raised.

No dispute award is given.

R.N. RAI, Presiding Officer

Date : 31-01-2008

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2008

का.अ. 450.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, चेन्नई, के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/ग्राम न्यायालय, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ आई डी सं. 405/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11-2-2008 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[फा.सं. एल-30011/48/2004-आईआर(एम.)]

एन.एस. बोरा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 11th February, 2008

S.O. 450.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. I. D. No. 405/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Chennai now as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bharat Petroleum Corp. Ltd., Chennai, and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 11-2-2008.

[F.No. L-30011/48/2004-IR(M)]

N.S. BORA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT, CHENNAI**

Wednesday, the 19th September, 2007

PRESENT :

Shri K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 405/2004

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. and their Workmen)

BETWEEN :

Petroleum Employees : I Party/Petitioner
Association
Regn. No. 375/77
Rep. By its General Secretary
C/o BPCL, Iriumpanam,
Kochi, Kerala-682309

AND

Bharat Petroleum Corporation : II Party/Respondent
Ltd.,

Rep. By its Dy. General
Manager (HRS) No. 1,
Ranganathan Gardens
Off. 11th Main Road, Anna
Nagar, Chennai-600040

APPEARANCE :

For the 1st Party/Petitioner : M/s. R. Vaigai & Anna
Mathew S. Vaidyanathan

For the 2nd Party/
Management : M/s. T.S. Gopalan & Co.

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-30011/48/2004-IR(M) dated 17-08-2004 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication. The schedule mentioned in that order is :

"Whether the imposition of punishment by the management of Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. against the Office Bearers of Petroleum Employees Association, S/Sri Charles Rajkumar and T. Velusamy are legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman are entitled?"

2. After the receipt of Industrial Dispute, this Tribunal has numbered it as ID 405/2004 and issued notices to both sides. Both parties entered appearance through their advocates and filed their claim statement and counter statement respectively.

3. The allegation in the claim statement are briefly as follows :

The petitioner union espouses the cause of the workmen viz. Charles Rajkumar and T. Velusamy. During 1997, the petitioner union was a majority at Coimbatore. Charles Rajkumar, the Joint Secretary

of the union was a protected workman at the relevant point of time. Apart from the petitioner union, there are two other unions in the Coimbatore plant viz. Petroleum Employees Union, Chennai & Petroleum Workers Union, Chennai which had a majority of workmen as their members. On 19-02-1997 at about 09.00 AM though adequate workmen were available for work, contract labourers engaged in the painting work inside the Coimbatore LPG plant. The above persons do not know the fundamentals of the operations of the plant but they were engaged inside the LPG plant (zero zone), which is the most dangerous place of activity. All the above unions objected to this engagement which was against the understanding as well as written agreement between BPCL and the unions. Despite the protests by leaders of the union, the LPG filling operations were continued by the Management. Angered by this action of the Management, the entire workers and the workmen stopped their work and came out of the plant. Even though, a similar issue of engagement of contract workmen in the zero zone on the previous day i.e. on 18-02-1997, it was sorted out by the withdrawal of contract workmen from the work spot and also the Management assured the union leaders that contract labourers will not be engaged inside the filling shed. Since, the Management has engaged the contract labourers on 19-02-1997, all the workers got agitated. As representatives of the petitioner union, Sri Charles Rajkumar contact the Vice-President of the union at Kochi from the Manager's cabin and the matter was discussed between the Vice-President and the Manager and it was sorted out the same and the workmen resumed the work at 12.30 PM. Since the majority belonged to other two unions and since their members were not ready to work without the concurrence of their leaders at Chennai. Though, the local leaders of the petitioner union had agreed to resume work by 10.00 AM, workers belonging to majority unions were not ready to resume the work and the Respondent had imposed "No Work No Pay" norm for the period of absence of the workers from their seats from 09.00 to 12.00 Noon on that day and the salary was deducted for all the workers present in the plant on that day. But surprisingly only the concerned workmen viz. Charles Rajkumar and T. Velusamy alone had been charge sheeted for no fault of theirs. Four charges were framed against them viz. under Clause 29.1.5 and 29.1.6 and 29.1.20 and 29.1.27. This was aimed at to cow the workmen at Coimbatore plant against joining as members of the petitioner union. When both the workmen were not capable to muster the support of the entire workmen by doing any action on their own, charges under this clause on subversion

of discipline or good behaviour on the Corporation's premises is quite biased. Further, there is no specific reference to any coercion or intimidation against any other workmen or person by these workmen. Hence, the charges under 29.1.6 have no relevance. There was no inciting or instigating by these workmen as alleged by the Respondent/Management. But, they only came out of the plant considering the seriousness of the issue along with other workers. Hence, Clause 29.1.27 also is not attracted. All the acts of the Respondent/Management were perpetrated by the then Dy. Manager of the LPG plant, Sri A. Kalyan who wanted to discriminate and punish the union leaders of the petitioner union who pointed out the wrong doings of the Deputy Manager against the workers. In the enquiry, there is no direct evidence against the concerned employees. Hence the allegations against the concerned employees are only hearsay with any material direct evidence. The alleged incident has taken place on 19-02-1997 but the office bearers of the petitioner union were charge sheeted only 04-09-1997 i.e. after a lapse of 6 months and 15 days. Further, after the domestic enquiry, punishment order dated 20-12-2001 was given to Charles Rajkumar only on 16-12-2004 and on Velusamy only on 09-01-2002 i.e. after a lapse of 4 years and 11 months. It is a clear case of victimization as well as discrimination of union functionaries which is also an unfair labour practice. By this, promotion opportunities of the concerned employees have been lost. Only for the reason that the contract workers are not trained to work inside the plant on LPG Bottling jobs and they have not qualified or knowledgeable enough to handle the hazardous product, LPG, the engagement of contract workers inside the LPG Bottling plant is opposed by the unions. But quite contrary to the assurances, the contract men were engaged on zero zone on 19-02-1997 which was vehemently opposed by all the workers. Further, during the year 1993, four contract workmen and a permanent workmen died one by one inside the LPG Bottling plant premises in broad daylight due to lack of knowledge and negligence of the contract workers. Furthermore, when three other union members were also participating in the incident, the issuance of the charge sheet and instituting of domestic enquiry on the office bearers of the petitioner union is a clear case of mala fide intention of the Management. The findings and the conclusion arrived in the domestic enquiry are totally biased. When all the employees have participated in the flash strike, which is totally justified, the action of the Management have targeted two active members of the petitioner union alone is not only illegal but

also unwarranted. A similar incident has taken place in Shakurbasti near Delhi in similar plants where contract labourers were engaged and there was a fire accident and blast due to mishandling and there was loss of life and entire plant was completely burned out. Therefore the action taken against the concerned employees is not fair on the part of the Respondent/Management. Hence, the petitioner union prays this Tribunal to set aside the imposition of punishment by the Respondent/Management and also prays to restore the benefits that was deprived pursuant to the punishment and other consequential benefits.

4. But as against this, the Respondent in his counter statement contended that the petitioner union is put to strict proof of its representative character as well as its authority and competence to raise the dispute. There is no valid industrial dispute and the order of reference is bad in law. This Respondent is having a LPG plant at Peelamedu in Coimbatore. For operation, the cylinders were placed on a conveyor and after they were filled up, it would be kept in filling shed and directly loaded into the lorries. In the process, the Management will do thorough check to eliminate any leak and if there is any defect, the defective cylinder will be kept aside and if the defects are minor in nature, they would be attended to then and there and they would be sent to filling shed and there is any major defect for correction, then the gas will be flushed out and only after the flushing, the empty cylinder sent for repairs. This operation is called evacuation. The LPG plant at Peelamedu has a fixed complement of permanent workmen. It has also been registered as Principal Employer under the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act and contract workmen are engaged for painting, loading and unloading operations. Whenever there is large unscheduled absenteeism of permanent workmen, the existing employees of the plant will be required to work overtime to carry out the normal operations even in such cases if sufficient number of workmen are not available, the plant used to engage casual workmen and these casual workmen are engaged only for manual job like movement of materials or shifting of cylinders from one place to another and they are not engaged for carrying out the critical operations of filling or even evacuation work. The concerned workmen in the year 1995 left the majority union and joined in the petitioner union and from that date always these workmen never failed to seize any opportunity to show one-upmanship by projecting the petitioner union as the crusader of the workmen then the other two existing unions and they used to pick up trivial issues, magnify them and precipitate confrontation. On 19-04-1996, Charles Rajkumar and another workmen belonging to petitioner union instigated the workmen and brought about work stoppage. A charge sheet was issued to him

and after due enquiry, he was awarded the punishment of reduction in basic pay. On 18th and 19th February, 1997, there was large absenteeism of permanent workmen and there was no adequate manpower to run the plant, consistent with the past practice, two contract workmen who were attending to some painting job were engaged as casual workmen only for manual shifting of cylinder from the filling area to the Evacuation unit. But, at about 09.00 AM the concerned workmen instigated the other workmen to stop work on the ostensible reason that contract workmen were engaged in evacuation job. By this, the entire operations in the filling area came to a halt. The supervisory staff and officers had to carry out the work. The striking workmen resumed work only at 12.50 PM. The Officer In-charge of the filling shed reported that on instigation of Sri Charles Rajkumar and T. Velusamy, all the workmen had resorted to work stoppage from 09.00 AM. Due to this incident, the two workmen viz. Charles Rajkumar and T. Velusamy were served with charge sheet and since their explanation was not satisfactory, a departmental enquiry were ordered to be conducted. In two separate enquiries, they were held liable for the charges and punishment was awarded after following the procedure. The enquiries were conducted in conformity with the principles of natural justice and the findings of the Enquiry Officer are justified. The punishment awarded to the two workmen is also justified and valid in law. If this act of indiscipline was not dealt with suitably, it would have sent wrong signals to the workmen that acts of indiscipline will be tolerated. It is not admitted by the Respondent that Charles Rajkumar was recognized as protected workmen at relevant point of time. It is only because of the instigation of Charles Rajkumar and T. Velusamy, the workmen were resorted to the work stoppage on 19-02-1997. No doubt, the Respondent Management had to hold negotiations with the unions including the petitioner union but that does not mean the petitioner was justified in precipitating the work stoppage. Therefore, the disciplinary action against the concerned employees was fully justified, that they were guilty of charges and the punishment awarded to them was also justified and therefore, they are not entitled to any relief. Hence, the Respondent prays that the claim may be dismissed with costs.

5. Again, the petitioner union in this rejoinder contended that the petitioner union has all the right "to espouse their employees cause and file this industrial dispute. The allegation that this Tribunal has no jurisdiction is without any substance. The evacuation work is a critical one and since this work is a critical job, it cannot be entrusted to contract workmen who are engaged in painting work. The Respondent/Management is bound to extend protection to Sri Charles Rajkumar as Joint Secretary of the Petroleum Employees Association during the relevant period for which the petitioner completed

necessary formalities. That all the three unions were involved in the incident and in the agitation on 19-02-1997, the members of the petitioner union alone were given show-cause notice and charge sheet. This shows the unfair labour practice indulged in by the Respondent/Management. The punishment awarded to the concerned employees is pre-determined even before commencing the enquiry proceedings which is discriminatory and vindictive. Hence, the petitioner union prays an award to be passed in favour of the concerned employees.

6. Points for determination are :

- (i) Whether the imposition of punishment by the Respondent/Management against Charles Rajkumar and T. Velusamy are legal and justified?
- (ii) To what relief the workmen are entitled?

Point No. 1

7. In this case, it is admitted that Respondent/Management is having an LPG plant at Peelamedu in Coimbatore for filling up the LPG in the cylinders. It is also admitted that on 19-02-1997, the filling operations was stopped from 09.00 AM and continued till 12.50 PM on the ground that two contract workmen are engaged in the filling operations work. As per the contention of the Respondent/Management, contract workmen are engaged for painting, loading and unloading operations and whenever there is large unscheduled absenteeism of permanent workmen, the existing employees in the plant will be required to work overtime only if sufficient number of workmen are not available even by working overtime, the plant used to engage casual workmen. Further, the contract workmen were engaged for manual jobs like movement of materials or shifting of cylinders from one place to another and they were not engaged for carrying out the critical operations of filling or even evacuation work. But, on the other hand, on the side of the petitioner, it is alleged that the workforce was normal on that day, the Management has engaged two contract workmen in the zero zone which was opposed by the workman and they asked the Management not engaged the contract workmen which was not accepted by the Management and therefore all the workmen were instantaneously stopped the work and only after their acceptance that not to engage contract workmen in the zero zone, they have resumed the work after 12.50 PM. It is admitted fact filling work was stopped from 09.00 AM to 12.50 PM on 19-02-1997, the Management has charge-sheeted one Charles Rajkumar and T. Velusamy who are members of the petitioner union for instigating the workmen to stop work and after the enquiry they have been imposed the punishment of reduction in their salary and so on.

8. On the side of the petitioner, one Balagopalan was examined as WW1 and Ex. 1 to Ex. 23 are marked on the side of the petitioner. On the side of the Respondent no oral evidence was adduced nor marked any documents. The learned counsel of the petitioner contended that though the Respondent/Management has examined four witnesses in the domestic enquiry, there are no eyewitness to substantiate the contention of the Management that the concerned employees viz. Charles Rajkumar and T. Velusamy were instigating the workers to stop the filling work. Further, the Management has admitted that there are three unions in the Southern Region and the workmen were belonging to all the three unions. Consequently, the entire members were not members of the petitioner union. When Charles Rajkumar and T. Velusamy were not leaders of the entire workmen and that too they are representing only the petitioner union, it cannot be said that these two persons have instigated all the workmen to stop work. Further, there is no direct evidence to state that these two persons have instigated all the workmen to stop work. Under such circumstances, the findings given by the Enquiry Officer and the punishment by the disciplinary authority is illegal. Even though, it is alleged that MW4 viz. Sri U.D. Joshi who was working as Filling Shed Officer at Coimbatore Filling Centre has stated that he suggested to Charles Rajkumar that both (he and Charles Rajkumar) can go and discuss the matter with the Installation Manager but he did not listen and he gave instructions for stopping the work and the filling operations were stopped by the workmen as per his instruction, he has not clearly stated that Charles Rajkumar was instrumental for the workmen to stop the work. Further, in his cross-examination, MW4 has clearly stated that he cannot tell Sri Charles Rajkumar could control the workmen belonging to other two different unions. Under such circumstances, his evidence is only an interested one and only to punish the concerned employees he has deposed that Charles Rajkumar has instigated the workmen to stop the work and no reliable person can place reliance on this evidence and come to the conclusion and only on the instigation of Charles Rajkumar and T. Velusamy the work was stopped on that day and therefore the findings of the Enquiry Officer is perverse and the imposition of punishment is also a perverse one.

9. But as against this, on behalf of the Respondent, it is contended that this is not a case of dismissal, discharge or retrenchment, therefore Section-11A of the I.D. Act cannot be invoked and only if the findings of the Enquiry Officer is found perverse, this Tribunal can reverse the imposition of punishment. Further, the learned counsel for the Respondent argued that no doubt perversity vitiates the disciplinary proceedings, there is two-fold test of perversity of any finding. The first one is that the finding is not supported by any legal evidence at all and the second

one that on the basis of material on record any reasonable person could have arrived at the finding. It can be termed as perverse only if it had been shown that such a finding is not supported by any evidence at all or is entirely based to the whole evidence adduced before it or any reasonable person could not have come to the finding on the basis of the evidence on record. He further argued even in case of a finding not supported by any legal evidence, there is an important point to be decided in the case is that in any case if the findings which may appear to be not supported by sufficient evidence or may be based on inadequate or unsatisfactory evidence, it cannot be said as perverse evidence. It is well settled that a wrong finding is not necessarily a perverse finding and a finding cannot be described as perverse merely because it is possible to take a different view on the finding nor a finding can be called perverse because in certain matters, the line of reasoning adopted by the Enquiry Officer is not very cogent or logical. In this case, the Enquiry Officer has clearly stated the man on the scene viz. MW 4 has stated that the two persons viz. Charles Rajkumar and T. Velusamy has asked the workmen to stop work and only on their instigation, the work was stopped on that day. There is no conclusive finding or evidence to show that his person has got any enmity against the concerned employees. Under such circumstances, based on the evidence adduced before the domestic Tribunal, the Enquiry Officer has come to a conclusion that the charges framed against the two persons have been proved. Therefore, the findings of the Enquiry Officer, which are based on legal evidence and the conclusion is to one which a reasonable man would come, therefore, it cannot be said that the findings of the Enquiry Officer and the punishment imposed by the Disciplinary Authority is perverse. Under such circumstances, he argued that this Tribunal cannot interfere in the imposition of punishment made by the domestic Tribunal.

10. But again, the learned counsel of the petitioner argued that MW4 has himself admitted that there are three union members among the workers and that he has stated that he cannot tell whether Charles Rajkumar alone could control the workmen belonging to other two different unions. No prudent man will come to conclusion that only on the instigation of Charles Rajkumar, the workers of all the three unions have stopped the work. Therefore, it should be a perverse finding of the Enquiry Officer and the imposition of punishment basing on the perverse finding is illegal. He further argued that it is well established from the evidence, that engagement of contract workers inside the LPG Bottling plant is opposed by all the unions on the ground that the contract workers were not qualified and knowledgeable enough to handle the hazardous product, LPG. Further, it is evident in the year 1993, contract workmen and permanent workmen died inside the LPG Bottling plant premises in broad daylight due to lack of knowledge and negligence of contract

workers. Under these circumstances, when the Management has engaged two contract workers in the bottling plant, all the workmen who have worked in the plant have spontaneously taken a decision to stop the work and agitated for their rights. Under such circumstances, no one can say that only on the instigation of concerned employees, the work was stopped. It is only to know the workmen showing as members of the petitioner union, the Management has taken the decision to victimize the office bearers of the petitioner union and imposed the punishment on the office bearers of the petitioner union. Though, I find some force in the contention of the learned counsel of petitioner and since it is not a case of discharge, dismissal or retrenchment and since Section 11A of the I.D. Act cannot be taken into account, I find the finding given by the Enquiry Officer cannot be stated as perverse. The finding given by the Enquiry Officer in this case is supported by some evidence though it can be stated not supported by sufficient evidence or based on inadequate evidence, I cannot find that the finding is a perverse one as such I am not inclined to accept the contention of the learned counsel of the petitioner that the finding of the Enquiry Officer and the imposition of punishment is illegal or unjustified. As such, I find this point against the petitioner.

Point No. 2

The next point to be decided is to what relief the workmen are entitled ?

10. In view of my findings that the imposition of punishment by the Respondent/Management against the concerned employees is legal and justified, I find the concerned employees are not entitled to any relief.

11. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 19th September, 2007).

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :

For the I Party/Petitioner : WW1, B. Balagopalan

For the II Party/
Management : None

Documents Marked :

On the Petitioners side

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	04-05-2002	Executive Committee Meeting Minutes—Literal translation
W2	30-09-2002	General Body Meeting Minutes—Literal translation
W3		Bye-laws of the Union

W4	2006	Pay roll—check off
W5	Nil	Domestic Enquiry Proceedings relating to Mr. Charles Rajkumar
W6	13-09-1999	Letter of the Defence enclosing written arguments
W7	21-12-2000	Enquiry Officer's report.
W8	Nil	Exhibits and correspondence among the parties in the domestic enquiry
W9	04-09-1997	Charge Sheet
W10	09-01-2002	Letter communicating the punishment order
W11	20-12-2001	Order of punishment
W12	18-03-1998	Domestic Enquiry proceedings relating to Velusamy
W13	04-09-1997	Charge Sheet
W14	Nil	Explanation
W15	05-12-1997	Notice of enquiry
W16	Nil	Exhibits and correspondence among the parties in the domestic enquiry
W17	18-02-1999	Presenting Officer's written submission
W18	12-04-1999	Defence submission
W19	03-02-2001	Letter of Velusamy to the respondent
W20	Nil	Comments on the Enquiry Report
W21	21-10-2000	Letter enclosing Enquiry Officer's Report
W22	09-01-2002	Letter of the management to T. Velusamy
W23	20-12-2001	Punishment imposed on T. Velusamy
W24	10-02-2002	General Body Meeting

From the Management side :

Ex. No. Date Description

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 451.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ऑयल इंडिया लिमिटेड, दुलियाजान के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय

सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, गुवाहाटी के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 11/2005) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11-2-2008 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं एल-30012/35/2005-आईआर (एम)]

एन. एस. बोरा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 11th February, 2008

S.O. 451.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 11/2005) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Guwahati now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Oil India Ltd., Duliajan and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 11-2-2008.

[No. L-30012/35/2005-IR (M)]

N. S. BORA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, GUWAHATI

Present : Sri H. A. Hazarika,
Presiding Officer,
CGIT-cum-Labour Court,
Guwahati

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute between :

The Management of Oil India Ltd., Duliajan

Vrs.

Their Workman, Sri Ruchi Nath Baruah.

ADVOCATES

Mr. S. N. Sarma : Senior Advocate

Mr. N. Sarma : Advocate

Mr. T. C. Chutia :

Mr. S. Nath : Advocates for the
Workman

Ref. No. 11 of 2005

Date of Award : 04-02-2008

AWARD

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi vide its Notification No. L-30012/35/2005-IR (M) dated 28-10-2005 and F. No. L-30012/35/2005-IR (Misc) dated 22-05-2006 referred this Industrial Dispute arose between the management of Oil India Limited, Duliajan and their Workman Sri Ruchi Nath Baruah, in exercise of power conferred by Clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and

Sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) for adjudication on the basis of the following Schedule :—

SCHEDULE

“Whether the industrial dispute raised by Shri Ruchi Nath Baruah, an ex-employee of Oil India Ltd. over his dismissal from service, justified? If not, what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?”

2. This Award is arising out of the preliminary issue framed vide my order dated 7-3-2007. As regards framing of preliminary issue there was hearing on 7-3-2007. The learned Senior Advocate for the Management Sri S. N. Sarma argued that the Management has raised the question of preliminary issue in Para 17 of the W.S. filed by the Management as well as it is reflected in their prayer portion. Mr. T. Chutia, Advocate appeared for the workman conceded that the point for preliminary issue in inserted by the Management in their W.S. and the workman side will not file Written Objection and relied on the W.S. filed by the workman. I have perused the Para 17 as well as the prayer portion of the W.S. filed by the Management. I also perused the W.S. filed by the Workman.

3. After careful scrutiny and hearing of the learned Advocates of both sides the following issue is framed.

“Whether the domestic enquiry made against the workman is fair or not?”

4. The charge against the workman Sri Ruchi Nath Baruah briefly from the narration of the show cause notice, Ext. 2 is that the workman who was a senior assistant to Department of Land was entrusted to pay surface compensation for the land measuring 31 Bighas 3 Kathas 11 Lechas for the location of the MTC near Margharita. The workman prepared enumeration list wherein he made nine fictitious persons made payment and shown and defalcated all total accumulation of Rs. 4,26,973.15 (Rupees four lakhs twenty six thousand nine hundred seventy three and paise fifteen only). That the concerned Gaon Bura who identified the occupiers/Pattadars of the Loc-MTC stated that he had neither put his LTI nor Seal on the above mentioned enumeration lists prepared by the workman concerned. Further, he reiterated that nine persons as mentioned do not hail from the village under his jurisdiction. That the Pattadars of Dag Nos. 59, 34, 27, 24 and 60 in the said location had confirmed that these nine persons were not occupiers over their land. That the concerned Lot Mandal after checking the records confirmed that these nine persons do not appear in the Government Revenue Records as occupiers. That the workman concerned directly associated with the preparation of enumeration lists and made the Surface Compensation for the location of MTC.

5. In support of their contention the Management examined Sri Abhijit Dam, who is also cross-examined by the learned Advocates for the workman Sri T. C. Chutia. The workman also examined himself as witness in relation to the preliminary issue framed and he is also cross-examined by the learned Senior Advocate for the Management Sri S. N. Sarma.

6. Sri Abhijit Dam, solitary witness of the Management at the stage of preliminary evidence stated that he was entrusted by the Management vide Ext. 1 to hold enquiry. He sent a show cause notice to the workman Sri Ruchi Nath Baruah. Exts. 3 and 4 are the reply made by workman. Management appointed Sri S. K. Deka as Management representative in the enquiry. The Management notified the workman about the date and venue of the enquiry. Being holiday, the enquiry was deferred and fixed on 16-05-2001. Vide Ext. 9 the workman wrote a letter asking the Management to hold exparte decision. The Management vide Ext. 10 informed the workman that whatever he was to say he should appear before the Enquiry Officer and say before the Enquiry Officer. On 16-05-2001 the workman was absent and the enquiry was adjourned and the next date was communicated to the workman. Similarly four dates were adjourned for the enquiry. Ext. 11 to Ext. 11(38) is the series of enquiry proceeding. The Enquiry Officer also gave last chance to the Workman to appear in the enquiry. Even after that the workman did not appear and enquiry was made exparte. The Management examined their witnesses before him and he recorded their statements. The Enquiry Officer decided to examine one witness at Khumchai village and intimated the workman to accompany to Khumchai village for examination of witness but the workman did not turn up. Accordingly the Enquiry Officer examined the witness at Khumchai village without the workman. Again vide Ext. 11(33), He informed the workman about the date, venue and asked him to accompany the Enquiry Officer to Margharita but the workman did not turn up. Accordingly he examined the witness at Margharita Circle Office in absence of the Workman. Then when the recording of the Management witnesses were over the workman was informed to come for this defence. He forwarded the copies of the entire proceeding to the Workman but the workman did not turn up. The Management submitted their written brief which was forwarded to the workman. Then the workman prayed for some time to submit his defence statement vide Ext. 11(62). Ultimately on 29-6-2002 the workman appeared in the enquiry and submitted his defence statement. Ext. 11(66) is his defence statement. The workman was also asked whether he has anything to submit over and above his written statement but the workman said he stands by his defence statement and he has nothing to add. After that he has gone through the evidence adduced before him and also gone through the

documents exhibited. After thoroughly considering the evidence, exhibited documents he submitted the enquiry report vide Ext. 12, Ext. 12(1) is his report and Ext. 12(2) is his signature. He found that the charges leveled against the workman were proved. In cross-examination part he said Ext. 4(1) is an Annexure to Ext. 4 as regards alleged D.A., T.A. claimed by the Gaon Burah but he is not sure whether Ext. 4(1) is the signature of Kiang Larung Chingpho or not which is not sure whether it was executed by the Gaon Burah or not. At the time of his enquiry he did not enquire about the genuineness of the receipt. He did not summon all the signatories relating to the enumeration sheets. He is not concerned about how many compensation was paid to how many enumeration sheet. The thumb impression Ext. 11(82)(i) is alleged to be of Gaon Burah but exactly he does not know whether it is the signature of Gaon Burah or not. Compensation were paid through cheque. The question put by the Management representative during the course of enquiry. Ext. 11(36)(iii) is the signature of I. Rajkova, Senior Assistant of Margarita Revenue Circle. Ext. 11(36)(iv) is the signature of Management Representative Mr. S. K. Deka. Ext. 11(36)(v) is the signature of Mr. T. Borthakur who is an independent witness. Except the independent witnesses Mr. P. Deka and T. Borthakur no other witnesses were present while recording statement of Gaon Burah Kiang Larung. In Ext. 11(36) Gaon Burah signed at the Office of the Margarita Revenue Circle. The Gaon Burah denied that he did put his L.T.I. in the enumeration sheets. The Gaon Burah told him that the name mentioned in Ext. 11(37) were not known to him as they never lived in his village or nearby village. Except 9 persons mentioned in Ext. 11(37) the Gaon Burah was never asked about the other 11 persons whose names were apparent in enumeration sheets. The charge was that 9 fictitious persons were paid surface compensation for location of MTC. He denied that he has not made the enquiry properly. He also denied that reasonable opportunity was not given to the workman during the course of the enquiry. The workman was replied vide Ext. 11(12) to come to the Enquiry Officer and to say whatever he is to say.

7. In the evidence the Workman Sri Ruchi Nath Baruah deposed that the replied against the Ext. 2 vide Ext. 4 and Ext. 4(1) is his signature. He requested the Enquiry Officer to summon all the signatories of all enumeration lists of location MTC before the Enquiry Board to give evidence and to cross-examine. Ext. 11(10)A is his signature in Ext. 11(66) is his written statement. He prepared the enumeration lists jointly with the Land Officer, Accounts Clerk, and Accounts Officer. He has not seen the signature of the Accounts Officer in Ext. 11(117) to Ext. 11(136). The enumeration list was not prepared by him alone. Ext. 11(82)1, is the LTI of Gaon Burah, who was the first witness. All the payments are paid to the beneficiaries by account payee cheques.

Payment receipts are signed by the Land Officer. Ext. 11(36)(2) is incomplete signature of Gaon Burah. The Enquiry Officer did not give him enough opportunity to defend his case. The witnesses were not summoned as per his requests. The Enquiry Officer treated wrongly the signatories of the enumeration list as witnesses. In cross-examination he stated that had he not been dismissed he would have been retired on 31-8-2007 on superannuation. By Ext. 3 he prayed for some time to submit his reply on the show cause notice. Ext. 3(1) is his signature. He received Ext. 6 on 26-4-2001. Ext. 6(1) is his signature. He also received Ext. 8 and Ext. 8(1) is his signature. Vide Ext. 9 he informed the Chief Manager Land that ex parte decision may be taken by them without holding departmental enquiry as he has been submitted written explanation against the charge. Ext. 9(1) is his signature. In reply to Ext. 9, Ext. 10 was issued which he received on 12-5-2001. Ext. 10(1) is his signature. He did not appear in the relevant departmental enquiry. He received Exts. 11(1), 11(3), 11(5), 11(7), 11(9), 11(12), 11(15), 11(20), 11(26), 11(33), 11(41), 11(43), 11(44), 11(46), 11(47), 11(61), 11(64) issued by the Enquiry Officer. Even after receiving of above letters he has not appeared in the departmental enquiry. He denied that the Company used to depute concerned Clerk from Accounts and Land departments. Land Officer Sri L. Rajkanwar at that time was dismissed. Name of the nine fictitious persons were not in the Revenue record as occupiers. He has received the report of the Enquiry Officer, Ext. 12(1) is the said report. The Enquiry Officer taken note of his defence statement in his report. Ext. 13 is the reply to the findings of the Enquiry Officer. Ext. 13(1) is his signature. Ext. 14 is advise of punishment issued to him. Ext. 14(1) was signed by the Chief Manager (Land), S. N. Phukan. He denied that reasonable opportunity was given to him in the departmental enquiry.

8. Heard the arguments submitted by the learned Advocates of both the sides and perused the Case Laws submitted by the learned Senior Advocates for the Management.

9. On scrutiny of the Written Statement and other relevant exhibited documents in the record I find the Management order for departmental enquiry for defalcation of Rs. 4,26,973.15 by the Workman Sri Ruchi Nath Baruah, who was a Senior Assistant II, Department of Land, Oil India Ltd. The enquiry was entrusted to Sri Abhijit Dam, Superintending Engineer, General Engineering Department. He was appointed as an Enquiry Officer vide Ext. 1. Being entrusted Sri Abhijit Dam sent a Show Cause Notice to the workman Sri R. N. Baruah vide Ext. 2. In the Ext. 2, the alleged amount of defalcation was shown in details and the Ext. 2 also contain the other relevant data such as, payment to the nine fictitious persons. It was also reflected in the Ext. 2 that the names

of nine fictitious persons was not found by the Lot Mandal in the Government Revenue Records as occupiers. That the workman was directly associated with the preparation of the enumeration list and payment of surface compensation for the location MTC. The Management appointed Sri S. K. Deka as Management representative in the enquiry. The enquiry was commenced giving Notification with specific date. It is ostensibly cleared that the workman received notice about initiation of enquiry against him. Vide Ext. 9 the workman wrote a letter asking the Management to hold ex parte decision. However, as per evidence I find, the Enquiry Officer repeatedly informed the workman to appear before the Enquiry Officer and to say what he has got to say before the Enquiry Officer. But in spite of adjournment of the enquiry proceeding the workman wilfully did not come before the Enquiry Officer. The Enquiry Officer also gave him last chance to appear in the enquiry. Even then the workman did not care to appear before the Enquiry Officer and as such, the enquiry was proceeded ex parte. The Management got the opportunities of examining their witnesses. Even when workman was intimated to go to village Khumchai village on the date of examination of the witnesses but the workman did not turn up. The basic question is to scrutiny here is to see, whether reasonable opportunities of being heard was offered to the workman or not. I find enquiry officer who seems to be very much neutral and high official and at the time of enquiry he was Superintending Engineer, General Engineering Department and while he was appeared before me as witness in the Dock he deposed that he is Dy. Chief Engineer, Inspection Wing in OIL at Kolkata Branch Office. Hence, I find a competent person was appointed as Enquiry Officer. I find nothing that he deposed falsely against the workman. The Management has as per procedure appointed a Management representative. The appointment of Enquiry Officer was made through the Chief Engineer General. Admittedly the workman did not appear before the Enquiry Officer. The Enquiry Officer after giving full opportunities proceeded the enquiry and completed the departmental enquiry and submitted his enquiry report vide Ext. 12(1) containing 8 pages. Ext. 12(2) is his signature. According to Enquiry Officer the charge against the workman was proved. On the basis of the report the Management dismissed the workman vide Ext. 14 with effect from 01-06-2003. In this connection I have perused the Case Laws submitted by the Management.

(1997) 6 Supreme Court Cases 415,

State of T.N. and Others—Appellants—Vrs—M. Natarajan and Another—Respondents.

(2005) 11 Supreme Court Cases 546.

Cheripalli Madar—Appellant—Vrs—Assistant Division Engineers and Others—Respondents.

I find the Case Laws submitted by the Management is befitting with the present case.

10. The workman sought some defence through some documents and on careful scrutiny I find that defence is not satisfactory and acceptable. The Management has proved the charge against the workman fully. The charge against the workman is proved by the Management through a proper departmental proceeding. It appears to me the workman desperately did not care the enquiry. The decision on ex parte hearing is justified. Hence, I find departmental proceeding is properly made and all opportunities required as per procedure was offered to the workman. The workman though received all the intimations did not care to be present before the Enquiry Officer and to make his defence as per procedure. It appears to me the Workman commanded the Enquiry Officer without appearing before the Enquiry Officer.

11. Under the above facts and circumstances I am satisfied that the departmental proceeding is properly done and the Management has rightly dismissed the workman.

12. The workman is dismissed through a departmental proceeding and on being satisfied I agree with the departmental proceeding is fair and proper. Now I am to see whether the quantum of punishment is proper or not.

13. Being Senior Assistant to Department of Land he was entrusted with very important job where money involved. It appears that he defalcated Rs. 4,26,973.15 showing payment to nine fictitious persons. It is a very serious economic offence. In my opinion, the dismissal is the proper punishment in the present circumstances of the case and quantum of punishment is justified. Admittedly his date of retirement was on 31-8-2007. Even if his date of retirement would have not been passed on 31-8-2007, he is not entitled for reinstatement or other relief after committing of such a huge defalcation of money.

14. In the result, I am satisfied that the departmental proceeding is fair and proper and charge is proved. The dismissal is justified, the workman is not entitled for any relief.

15. Send the award as per procedure confidentially to the Government concerned.

H. A. HAZARIKA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 452.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एफ.सी.आई. के प्रबंधन के संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण

चैनई के पंचाव (संदर्भ संख्या 9/2005) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11-2-2008 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं एल-22012/346/2004-आईआर (सी-II)]

अजय कुमार गौड़, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 11th February, 2008

S.O. 452.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 9/2005) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of FCI and their workman which was received by the Central Government on 11-2-2008.

[No. L-22012/346/2004-IR (C-II)]

AJAY KUMAR GAUR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Friday, the 23rd November, 2007

PRESENT : K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 9/2005

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of FCI and their workmen]

BETWEEN

1. The President : II Party/Petitioner's Union
North Coimbatore FCI
Workers Labour Contract
Co-operative Society Ltd.
Tatabad,
Coimbatore-641012
2. Kovai Mavatta Baran : I Party/Petitioner's Union
Thookkuvoor
Thozhilalar Sangam
99, Rangan Street
Coimbatore-641012

AND

The Senior Regional Manager : II Party/Management
Regional Office
Food Corporation of India
5/54, Greaves Road,
Chennai-600006

APPEARANCE :

For the Petitioner No. 1	: In Person
Petitioner No. 2	: M/s. Row and Reddy
For the Management	: Sri M. Imthias

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-22012/346/2004-IR (C-II) dated 17-12-2004 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

The schedule mentioned in that order is :

“Whether the demand of the Kovai Mavatta Baram Thookkuvoor Thozhilalar Sangam to provide employment to 150 contract workers (list enclosed) under direct payment system in FCI is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief they are entitled ?”

2. After the receipt of Industrial Dispute, this Tribunal has numbered it as ID 9 of 2005 and issued notices to both parties. Both sides appeared through their Advocates and filed their claim statement and counter statement respectively.

3. The allegations in the claim statement of the first petitioner are briefly as follows :

The Food Corporation of India Main Depot in Coimbatore has commenced its operation from 1965 onwards. The Peelamedu Depot which is also coming under the control of the Food Corporation of India has commenced its operations only in 1984. On the other hand, the workers of the Peelamedu Depot have been absorbed under direct payment system whereas the workers of the Main Depot viz. Coimbatore Depot have not been absorbed under direct payment system on the allegation that the Peelamedu Depot was notified by the Ministry of Labour and the Coimbatore Depot has not been notified. In view of the above, the workers of the Main Depot, Coimbatore have decided to form Co-operative Society to undertake Handling and Transport work of the Main Depot to replace the Private Contract System. As such the Society was formed in the year 1993 and it was formed exclusively by the workers without any outsiders in accordance with FCI policy and the FCI has awarded the contract for a period of 2 years from 01-08-1995 to 31-07-1997 when the contract was coming to an end, the Society has requested the FCI to award the contract for the same Society to avoid displacement of workers but the FCI has floated tender for the appointment of Handling and Transport Contract for the Coimbatore Depot and therefore the Society filed Writ Petition for continuance of operations in the Depot and obtained stay order for maintaining

status quo at the time of awarding the contract at the rate at 295% ASOR awarded to the Society for 2 years. After that, though the Society have requested the Food Corporation of India to revise the rates, FCI refused to raise the same on the ground the High Court has ordered status quo and hence question on enhancing any rate beyond will not arise. On the other hand, the rates for direct payment system workers have been raised 5 times from 1997 to till date. Thus, the petitioner's society is working for the same rate from 1995 viz. for the past 10 years. Hence, the Society requests this Tribunal to revise their Handling and Transport rates also on par with Peelamedu Depot. Hence, the Society requests this Tribunal to introduce direct payment system to the workers of the Society working in the FCI Depot, Coimbatore and if it is not possible to introduce direct payment system as a stopgap arrangement, this Tribunal must enhance the Handling and Transport rates at par with rates payable to direct payment system workers. When the Writ Petition No. 7381 was filed in the year 1997, the total number of workers were only 130. In order to complete all the contractual obligation, the Society has enrolled some more Head Load Workers as well as Casual Workers with the permission of the FCI. The Society has given a list of additional workers and it also prays the benefits extended to all the Society members and to the additional workers.

4. The allegations in the claim statement of the second petitioner are briefly as follows :

The members of the petitioner union are engaged in loading and unloading operations in the North Coimbatore Railway Yard of the Respondent Corporation. The Respondent is a statutory corporation constituted under the Food Corporation Act, 1964. The members of the petitioner union are engaged in the North Coimbatore Railway Yard through the North Coimbatore Food Corporation of India Workers Labour Contract Co-operative Society, which is a Society registered under Tamil Nadu Co-operative Societies Act. The 150 workmen have been working even prior to the formation of the Co-operative Society continuously without any break. The primary activities of the Food Corporation are purchase, storage, movement, distribution and sale of food grains. The corporation is wholly owned by the Government. In Tamil Nadu, the FCI have depots at Tuticorin, Thanjavur, Mannarkudi, Peelamedu in Coimbatore, North Coimbatore, Egmore, Arakkonam, Avaid and Vellore. While so, the Government of India issued notification dated 01-11-1990 in exercise of power conferred in Section 10 of the Contract Labour

Regulation Act and prohibiting the employment of contract labour in the godowns of FCI in which the process of operation or work of handling the food grains including the loading and unloading from any means of transport, storing was carried on. On the basis of the above notification, the workers at Peelamedu and the aforesaid depots were absorbed as direct employees of the Respondent Corporation. The Coimbatore North godown is hardly 5 km. away from the Peelamedu. The nature of work done by them is the same as that of the workers employed in Peelamedu godown. On 21-06-1993, the Respondent Corporation asked the workers to form themselves into a labour co-operative, so that the work can be given to the workers themselves instead of giving it to 3rd parties. Accordingly, the petitioner formed a Society and in the year 1993-1994, the first petitioner society was awarded the contract. In the year 1994, the workers struck work demanding contract employment. Instead of resolving the issue, the Respondent Corporation terminated the contract worker and hand it over to private contractor. During the year 1995, the petitioner union filed Writ Petition No. 5950 of 1995 in the Madras High Court challenging the action of the corporation dated 22-11-1994 terminating the work that was done by labour co-operative and giving it to a private contractor. When the corporation invited tender for supply of labour in an advertisement dated 14-05-1995, the petitioner union filed WPMP 11793 of 1995 in the above WP 5950 for an interim injunction. But only notice was issued in that WPMP, thereafter the petitioner moved a W.A. 654 of 1995 on 06-06-1995, the division bench of the High Court has ordered status quo. It is only thereafter the Corporation negotiated with the petitioner union and agreed to give the works to labour co-operative. When the contract was about to expire, the Corporation again issued an advertisement in the news paper on 10-05-1997 calling for tenders. Again the petitioner filed Writ Petition 7381 of 1997 for a Writ of Mandamus directing the Respondent in the WP to take steps under Section 10(1) of the Contract Labour Abolition and Regulations Act for abolition of contract labour and to absorb all the employees mentioned in the petition. On 21-05-1997 notice of motion was ordered and interim status quo was granted by the Hon'ble High Court. Subsequently, on 26-03-2004, the High Court has directed the Central Government to refer the dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal. The work done by the members of the petitioner union is perennial in nature. Further, there are employees in the corporation who is discharging similar duties, but as regular employees and they are now drawing

regular scale of pay. But, the members of the petitioner union was not given the same salary. Though, the members of the petitioner union are subject to supervision and control by the Officers of the Respondent Corporation, they are not given the regular status of the Respondent Corporation. The labour co-operative society is nothing but a collective body of the workmen engaged in North Coimbatore Depot and it has only done work pertaining to North Coimbatore Depot. It is not contract, registered under the Contract Labour Regulation Act but a co-operative society of the workers themselves. Though, the members of the petitioner union handling about 4,50,000 tonnes of food grains annually in the Respondent Corporation and though the work of the petitioner union is perennial in nature, the Respondent Corporation is depriving the workers the benefits of regular absorption which is unjust and arbitrary. The so called contract with the labour society is a sham and nominal, it is not a contract under Contract Labour Regulation and Abolition Act but only a camouflage to avoid the benefits to the members of the petitioner union. Further, the action of the Respondent Management in depriving the benefits of regular employment to the members of the petitioner union is unfair labour practice and contrary to Clause 10 of the 5th Schedule and hence illegal. When similar placed persons were already been absorbed and when there is no separate contract as envisaged in the Contract Labour Regulation and Abolition Act, the denial of benefits of regularization to the members of the petitioner union amounts to victimization and deprivation of workers rights. Hence it is illegal. Therefore, the petitioner union prays this Tribunal to direct the Respondent to absorb the petitioner union as direct employees.

5. But, as against this, the Respondent in his counter statement stated that this I.D. is not maintainable before this forum. The North Coimbatore FCI Workers Labour Contract Co-operative Society viz. first petitioner is formed by the workman themselves and no outsider has been functioning as Handling and Transport contractor under Contract Labour Regulation and Abolition Act and therefore, there is no employer-employee relationship between the FCI and the Workmen of the Society. It is false to contend the Respondent Management is working on commercial lines. The FCI is functioning on the subsidy granted by the Central Government. Under the Contract Labour Regulation and Abolition Act. The Ministry of Labour, Government of India is the appropriate government for the issue of notification abolishing the contract labour system in the depots of FCI. The Government of India constitute a committee known as Asnani Committee to go into the question of abolition of

contract system in FCI depots. On the recommendation of the Committee, the Ministry of Labour in 1987 called for work load data for the work performed in all the depots of FCI and after that 172 depots were notified by the Government of India throughout the country including Arakkonam, Avadi, Sevrur and Peelamedu for abolition of contract labour system. However, Coimbatore North Depot was not notified by the Government at that time, hence there is no scope for comparison for the workers working at Coimbatore depot and working at notified depots. Therefore, the petitioner's union demand for absorption of contract workers under the direct payment system cannot be made. The remuneration for the members of the petitioner union was disbursed by the Society and the Society was paid the amount as per the contract signed between the Management and the Society. The Society has to carry out the operations according to the conditions of the contract and being contractor, it does not have any locus standi to raise any I.D. against the FCI before this forum. There is no prohibition for employment of contract labours in the Coimbatore depot since it is a non-notified one. It is not correct to say in the year 1994, the contract workers struck work for demanding direct payment. But, it is only for the inclusion of outside labours numbering 30 as members of the Society which was beyond the scope of bye-laws of the Society. The allegation that the labourers have been directly engaged by the Corporation prior to 1990 is without any substance. The work in the depot was done only through contract system. It is not true to say that the workers of the Peelamedu Depot were absorbed by the FCI. On the other hand, they were working under direct payment system since Peelamedu Depot is notified depot and their payment for the work done was made by the Corporation directly on piece rate basis to eliminate the contract system in the depot. The FCI has never engaged the members of the petitioner union directly at any point of time. It is not correct to say, the contract with labour society is sham and nominal. The contract is a true one and is enforceable in the Court of Law. There is no denial of any benefit to the members of the petitioner union and the allegation that they are victimized by the members of the Corporation is without any substance. As per the Society (1st petitioner), the main claim is not absorption of service of workers and the main claim is enhancement of the present handling and transport charges. On the other hand, the main claim of the petitioner union (2nd petitioner) is for absorption of the labours directly under direct payment system which has been practiced in notified depots. Therefore, both the demand of the Society and also the Union is not maintainable. Hence the Respondent prays to dismiss the I.D. with their cost.

The points for determination are :

- (i) "Whether the demand of the Kovai Mavatta Baram Thookkuvoor Thozhilalar Sangam to

provide employment to 150 contract workers (list enclosed) under direct payment system in FCI is legal and justified ?”

(ii) If not, to what relief they are entitled ?

Point No. 1

6. The North Coimbatore FCI Workers Labour Contract Co-operative Society and Kovai Mavatta Baram Thookkurvoor Sangam are the two petitioners before this Tribunal claiming the relief for direct payment system for the 150 contract workers in FCI viz. Respondent herein. On behalf of the petitioners, the work done by members of the petitioner Sangam are perennial in nature and therefore the Respondent ought to have regularized them on regular basis. It is their further contention that there are other employees in the Corporation in various places who are discharging the similar duties of these 150 workers but they have been made as regular employees and they are receiving payment under direct payment and he also argued that the employees engaged in the depots like Tuticorin, Tanjore, Mannarkudi, Peelamedu, Egmore, Arakkonam, Avadi and Vellore are now getting their salary and other benefits through direct payment system, whereas the same is denied to the Coimbatore North Depot workers and therefore it is highly discriminatory and violation of the Constitution. Then petitioner also contended the labour co-operative society is nothing but a collective body of the workmen engaged in the North Coimbatore Depot and members are involved in the work in North Coimbatore Depot alone and therefore the Society is not a contractor registered under the Contract Labour Regulation and Abolition Act but a co-operative society of the workers themselves. The regular staff and officers of the Respondent Management alone who supervise the work of the workers of the petitioner union. The Officers of the Respondent Management alone exercise the power of control and supervision over these members of the petitioner union. It is their further contention that there is a huge volume of work at North Coimbatore godown and they are handling about 15,000 tons of food grains annually and in the absence of contractor, the members of the petitioner union have been directly employed by the Respondent, therefore, the so-called contract is only a sham and nominal and it is not a contract system under Contract Labour Regulation and Abolition Act but only a camouflage to avoid the benefits of direct payment system. In order to establish that the workmen of the petitioner union are under the direct control and supervision of the Respondent Management, the petitioner placed reliance on some of the documents viz. Ex. W1 to Ex. W3, Ex. W32, Ex. W33, Ex. W1 series is the order passed by the authority under the Workman Compensation Act directing the Management to pay compensation to the affected workmen. Ex. W2 is the letter by the Respondent Management with regard to disobedience of some of the

workers in the petitioner union. Similarly, Ex. W3 is another letter by the Respondent Management to the Society informing about the disobedience of some of the workers. Ex. W32 and Ex. W33 are the orders passed by the authority under Workman Compensation Act to the Management to pay compensation to the workers. On behalf of the petitioners, it is contended that these documents clearly established that the Respondent had direct control over the petitioners and further the supervision and control is also carried on by Respondent Management alone. But, I am not inclined to accept the contention of the petitioner because in any of these documents, it is not stated that the Respondent Management has taken direct action against the workers but it is only addressed to the Secretary of the Society to take action against the contract workers for disobeying the orders of the Supervisors. Thus, the petitioner taken the stand the Management at the request of the workers have taken the welfare measures and implementing the same, in view of their requests. Only when the workers demanded that all the 150 workers should be taken under direct payment system, the Management has refused to do the same and they have also filed a Writ before the Hon'ble High Court which was subsequently withdrawn on the request of the Management. When the Management has taken the employees in the Egmore Depot under direct payment system, they have not stated any reason for not taken the Coimbatore North Depot under the direct payment system. Though, they have stated that the Government has to take decision on the request of the petitioner union, under what circumstances they have taken the Egmore Depot under direct payment system and not the Coimbatore Depot which clearly establishes the discrimination in the action of the Respondent Management. The learned counsel for the petitioner further relied on the ruling reported in 1990, 2, LLJ, PAGE 443, SHANKAR MUKHERJEE AND OTHERS VS. UNION OF INDIA. In that the case “the Government of West Bengal issued notification under Section 10 of the Contract Labour Regulation and Abolition Act prohibiting employment of contract labour covering 65 jobs in the establishment of Indian Iron and Steel Co. Ltd., Burnpur. So far as the Brick Department is concerned, the notification prohibited “cleaning and stacking and other allied jobs except loading and unloading of the bricks from wagons and trucks”. This notification was challenged by filing a Writ Petition, the Supreme Court has held “there is no justification for excluding the job of loading and unloading of bricks from wagons and trucks from the purview of the notification. The exclusion of loading and unloading of bricks from wagons and the trucks from the said notification is struck down as being discriminatory and therefore violation of the Constitution of India”. The learned counsel for the petitioner further relied on the ruling report in 1978, 4, SCC, PAGE 257,

HUSSAINBHAI VS. THE ALATH FACTORY THOZHILALI UNION where the Supreme Court has stated "the employer and employee relationship and the workmen employed by independent contractor to work in employer's factory whether the workman is given the test determining whether he is the workman under the employer. It clearly states the true test may, with brevity, be indicated once again. Where a worker or group workers, labours to produce goods or services and these goods or services are for the business of another, that other is, in fact, the employer and he has economic control over the worker's subsistence, skill and continued employment, if he, for any reason, chokes, the worker is, virtually, laid off. The presence of intermediate contractors with whom alone the workers have immediate or direct relationship *ex contractu* is of no consequence when, on lifting the veil or looking at the conspectus of factors governing employment, we discern the naked truth though draped in different perfect paper arrangement, that the real employer is the Management, not the immediate contractor. The Court must be astute to avoid the mischief and achieve the purpose of the law and not be misled by the *maya* of legal appearances". The learned counsel for the petitioner relied on this decision and argued that the real employer in this case is only the Respondent Management and not the Society, the contract alleged to have been entered into by the Society and the Respondent Management is only sham and nominal and it is only the Respondent Management viz. FCI is the employer of the members of the petitioner union. He further argued as stated in 1990, 2, LLJ, Page 443, the Management under the pretext that the Government has not passed any notification except the contract labour in the North Coimbatore Depot is only discriminatory and also violative of the Constitution and therefore it is not valid law. The learned counsel for the petitioner further argued that in a similar case, the workmen represented by the Convener, FCI Labour Contractors raised a dispute to absorb the workmen employed in different food storage depots of FCI in South to regularize them. The Division Bench of the High Court has held "that they should be regularized as such". In this case the request of the petitioner union is only to introduce the direct payment system to the workers of the petitioner union as that of other FCI godown employees. But, the Respondent Management has refused to take the members of the petitioner union under direct payment system on the ground that the Government has not prohibited the contract labour system in the North Coimbatore Depot which is discriminatory and illegal.

7. But, as against this, on behalf of the Respondent it was contended that under the Contract Labour Regulation and Abolition Act, the Ministry of Labour, Government of India alone is the appropriate government for the issue of notification abolishing the Contract Labour

System in the depots of FCI. The Ministry of Labour, Government of India in this case constituted a committee known as Asnani Committee to go into the question of abolition of contract system in FCI Depots as per the Supreme Court of India's directions, the xerox copy of the order is marked as Ex. M1 and the committee has submitted its report and recommendation to the Ministry of Labour in 1987 and after that the Labour Ministry called for the workload data for the work performed in all the depots of FCI during the year 1987-88 and 1989 and after examining the report, the Government of India has notified that 172 depots of FCI wherein it has prohibited the Contract Labour System which includes, Arakkonam, Avadi, Sevur and Peelamedu while the Coimbatore North Depot was not notified by the Government for abolition of Contract Labour System at that time. Hence, the petitioner cannot compare the workload of the workers of other depots with that of Coimbatore North Depot. The Respondent Management also produced the copy of the notification viz. Ex. M2 and Ex. M3 and the FCI notification under Ex. M4. It is the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent that it is only the Government viz. Ministry of Labour, Central Government has been vested with the powers of abolition of Contract Labour System in FCI depots subject to fulfillments of condition in Section 10 in Contract Labour Regulation and Abolition Act. It is his further contention that the allegation that the members of the petitioner union are directly employed by the Respondent Management is without any substance. From the beginning, the loading and unloading work was handled only by the contractors and at no point of time the members of the petitioner union was engaged by the FCI directly. It is his further contention, the remuneration for the volume of work done by the members of the Society is paid by the Respondent Management to the Society as per the contract signed between the Management and the Society and the Society alone in turn disbursing the wages to the labourers. As such, being a contractor, the Society does not have any *locus standi* to raise any Industrial Dispute against the Respondent Management. It is his further contention, that for the labour contract, the society has also obtained licence from Regional Labour Commissioner under the Contract Labour Regulation and Abolition Act and the Respondent Management marked the copy of the license obtained by the Labour Society as Ex. M6. Though, it is alleged the workers of the Peelamedu Depot have been taken in the direct payment system since Peelamedu Depot is notified by the Government and there is prohibition for engagement of contract labours, they have taken under direct payment system but the Coimbatore North Depot is a non-notified one and as such the engagement of contract labours in the depot is permissible within the ambit of law. Though, the petitioners alleged that workers of the Coimbatore North Depot has been directly engaged by the Corporation prior to 1990 but they have not

produced a single scrap of paper to establish their contention. Thus, it is clear the work done in the Coimbatore North Depot is only through the contract system and by no other means. Further, though the petitioner has alleged that the workers of the Peelamedu Depot have been absorbed as direct employees, it is not true to say that Peelamedu workers were absorbed and they were not become direct employees of the Corporation. The fact is that the payment for the work done by them are made by the Corporation on piece rate basis to eliminate contract system in the depot since the said depot has been notified by the Government under Contract Labour Regulation and Abolition Act. Though, the petitioner argued that the contract entered into between the Society and the Management is sham and nominal, this allegation also is without any substance because the contract agreement between the Society and the FCI is enforceable one in the Court of Law and all the action taken by the FCI against the workers is only through the Society and not directly by the Management. Though, it is alleged that welfare measures were taken by the Respondent Management, it is only as per the agreement and also by the supplementary agreement, there is no direct relationship between the members of the petitioner union and the Respondent Management as master and servant. It is now well settled by the Supreme Court "there cannot be any absorption of contract labours directly and automatically and it was also admitted by the petitioner union before the Hon'ble High Court in Writ Petition No. 7381 of 1997 and therefore the High Court has directed the petitioner union to approach the appropriate forum. As such, since the petitioner union has not established that the contract system is sham and nominal and since they have not established that their work was controlled and supervised by the Respondent Management they cannot be entitled to any relief in this I.D. It is his further argument, under the Contract Labour Regulation and Abolition Act, only the Central Advisory Contract Labour Board alone has the power to decide the same. Though, the petitioner alleged that there are discriminatory attitude by the Respondent Management, it was not shown by the petitioner union what is the discriminatory action shown by the Respondent Management. In this I.D. the Society viz. the first petitioner has not claimed any absorption of service of workers but their main claim is only the enhancement of the present handling and transport charges whereas on the other hand the main claim of the labour union viz. the 2nd petitioner union is for the absorption of the labours under the direct payment system which has been practiced in the notified depots. Since, the claim of the petitioners are different and since they have not established before this Tribunal that the contract system is sham and nominal, they are not entitled to any relief. The learned counsel for the Respondent further contended after the Supreme Court's judgement in Uma Devi's case which says that "merely because an employee

had continued under cover of an order of the Court, under 'litigious employment', he would not be entitled to any right to be absorbed or made permanent in service". It is also well settled by that decision, "the Court must be careful in ensuring that do not interfere unduly with the economic/financial arrangement of the affairs of the State or its instrumentalities or lend themselves the instruments to facilitate the bypassing of the constitutional and statutory mandates" and in this case since the contract labour system has not been abolished by the Central Government which is the appropriate government under Contract Labour Regulation and Abolition Act, the petitioner cannot question the contract entered into between the Respondent Management and the Society and as such the members of the petitioner union cannot claim any right against the Respondent Management.

8. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent because though the petitioner alleged that there is discriminatory attitude between two sets of employees viz. employees of the Petitioner Union and Peelamedu Depot, it is clearly established before this Tribunal that the petitioner depot has not been notified by the Government under the Contract Labour Regulation and Abolition Act Section 10A whereas the Peelamedu Depot has been notified under the Contract Labour Regulation and Abolition Act. It is further shown that Coimbatore North Depot is a non-notified area and therefore there is no prohibition under the Contract Labour Regulation and Abolition for employing contract labours for the work of Coimbatore North Depot. Then again the petitioner alleged that the contract entered into between the Society and the Respondent Management is sham and nominal which they have not established that fact also with any satisfactory evidence. The circumstances shown before this Tribunal will not prove that the contract is a sham one. Though the Society viz. first petitioner union has asked the relief of enhancement of present handling and transport charges and since the Society has entered into an agreement with the Management it can raise this dispute at the time of executing the new agreement. As such I find since the petitioner has not established the fact that the contract is sham and nominal one and since they have not established the fact that they are under the direct employment of the Respondent Management, I am not inclined to hold that they are entitled to direct payment system as claimed by them.

Point No. 2

"The next point to be decided in this case is to what relief the 2nd petitioner union is entitled?"

9. In view of my foregoing findings that the members of the 2nd petitioner union are not entitled to direct payment system, I find they are not entitled to any relief in this I.D.

10. Thus the reference is disposed of accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 23rd November, 2007)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :—

For the I Party/ : WW1 Shri P. Pattilingam
Petitioner : WW2 Shri K. G. Jagannathan

For the II Party/ : MW1 Shri K. P. Hemachandran
Management

Documents Marked :—

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	21-01-2002	Order passed in W.C. 46/2000 by the Authority under Workmen Compensation Act, 1923
W2	08-10-2004	Letter from the Respondent
W3	27-10-2004	Letter from the Respondent
W4	04-09-1995	Letter from the Management
W5	15-12-1995	Letter from the Management
W6	29-07-1997	Lawyers Notice
W7	—	Order Passed in W.M.P. 11989/97 in W.P. No. 7381/97
W8	11-09-1999	Letter from the Society to the Management
W9	01-08-1997	Letter from the Management
W10	02-02-1998	Letter from the Society to the Management
W11	25-08-1999	Letter from the Management
W12	30-10-1999	Lawyers Notice
W13	09-05-2000	Letter from the Management
W14	—	Order passed by the Workman Compensation Authority
W15	30-04-2001	Letter from the Management
W16	16-05-2001	Letter from the Management
W17	04-06-2004	Letter from the Society
W18	18-08-2004	Letter from the Society
W19	06-10-2004	Letter from the Management
W20	08-10-2004	Letter from the Management
W21	09-10-2004	Letter from the Management

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W22	13-10-2004	Letter from the Management
W23	27-10-2004	Letter from the Management
W24	27-10-2004	Letter from the Society enclosing Bill No. 46
W25	20-11-2004	Circular
W26	17-01-2005	Letter from the Management
W27	02-02-2005	Letter from the Society
W28	25-04-2005	Letter from the Management
W29	09-06-2005	Letter from the Management
W30	—	Form 12-A
W31	—	Statement showing the details of Employer Contribution for the period February 2005 to May 2005
W32	—	Order passed by the workman compensation authority
W33	—	Order passed by the Workman compensation authority
W34	—	Few documents to show the difference in Pay between a DPS workman and the Society workmen
W36	—	Statement showing the difference between workmen of the Society and DPS workers

For the II Party/Management :—

M1	29-11-2001	H. Qrs. Lr. No. IR(L) 31(16)97 (Supreme Court Order) W.P. 13580/83
M2	01-09-1990	Gazette Notification
M3	31-12-1990	GOI Letter (Notified depots)
M4	14-09-1996	H. Qrs. Lr. No. IR(L) 8(22)94 (notified depots)
M5	27-04-1995	Tender Agreement S&C 13(5)/2/95 CON between FCI and North Coimbatore FCI Workers Labour Contract Coop. Society Ltd.
M6	17-11-1995	Licence issued to North Coimbatore FCI Workers Labour Contract Coop. Society Ltd. by the Labour authorities under Contract Labour (R&A Act, 1970)

Ex. No.	Date	Description
M7	05-09-1995	Supplementary Agreement between FCI and North Coimbatore FCI Workers Labour Contract Coop. Society Ltd.
M8	26-03-2004	Judgement in W.P. No. 7381 of 1997
M9	20-05-2003	H. Qrs. Lr. No. IR(L)/2001 (Findings of RLC, Bangalore)

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 453.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एफ.सी.आई. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 584/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11-2-2008 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं एल-22012/340/2000-आईआर (सी-II)]

अजय कुमार गौड़, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 11th February, 2008

S.O. 453.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 584/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of FCI and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 11-2-2008.

[No. L-22012/340/2000-IR (C-II)]

AJAY KUMAR GAUR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Friday, the 21st September, 2007

Present :

K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 584/2001

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of FCI and their workman]

BETWEEN

The District Secretary :
F.C.I. Employees Union,
Coimbatore 1st Party/Petitioner

AND

The District Manager :
Food Corporation of India
Coimbatore-641012 2nd Party/Respondent

APPEARANCE :

For the 1st Party/ : M/s. Balan Haridas,
Petitioner R. Kamatchi Sundaresan,
Advocates

For the 2nd Party/ : M. Imthias
Management

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-22012/340/2000-IR (C-II) dated 28-05-2001 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

The schedule mentioned in that order is :

“Whether the demand of the FCI Employee’s Union for regularisation of the services of Sri P. Jayabal, Scavenger, FCI, Salem is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. After the receipt of Industrial Dispute, this Tribunal has numbered it as ID 584/2001 and notices were sent to both sides. Both sides entered appearance through their advocates and filed their claim and counter statement respectively.

3. The allegation in the claim statement are briefly as follows :

The petitioner union espouses the cause of one Sri P. Jayabal, Scavenger in Salem FCI Depot. The FCI at Salem has a food Storage Complex with storage capacity of 25,000 metric tonnes at Sivadasapuram in Salem. It has also got an office and 60 permanent employees are working in the complex. The said godown was commissioned during the year 1993. The activities in the godown are perennial in nature. The storage and distribution of the food grains takes place throughout the year. Previously, FCI has not employed and scavenger to clean the godown. But, subsequently since there was an absolute need of a person to do cleaning and scavenging during May, 1994, it engaged Sri P. Jayabal for the purpose of scavenging and cleaning. He was also doing other sundry work given by the Respondent Management. Initially, he was paid by the Respondent directly, however, from January 1996 the wages of the concerned workman was being paid through a handling and transport

contractor. Even prior to that date viz. during 1976, the Central Government issued Notification dated 09-12-1996 prohibited employment of contract labour for sweeping, cleaning, dusting and watching of buildings owned and occupied by the establishments including FCI. The Respondent has issued a Circular dated 23-03-1999 stating that the above said Notification will apply to it. Even after that, the Respondent Management engaged the concerned workman directly and had been paying wages directly. But, with an ulterior motive, the Respondent from 1996 has been paid wages through handling and transport contractor. Even though the concerned workman worked for more than 7 years, he has not been regularized in the service. Further, after engaging an employee directly, the Management cannot terminate him as he is a direct employee. The concerned employee worked only under the direct control and supervision of the Respondent Management and the introduction of payment of wages through contractor is only sham and nominal. Further, the handling and transport contractor has nothing to do with the scavenging and cleaning work. Even on 26-04-1999, the Respondent Management of the Salem Depot has written a letter to the District Manager, Coimbatore wherein he has stated that the concerned employee's employment is absolutely necessary where about 65 staff and 2 officers are working. Since the work discharged by workman concerned is perennial in nature and since the Respondent's Depot at Salem have recommended the regularization of the workman's service, the action of the Management in not regularizing his service is illegal and against all canons of justice and fair play. Further, it is an unfair labour practice under the Industrial Disputes Act. The workman concerned has worked for more than 480 days continuously within the period of 24 calendar months, therefore, he is deemed to be a permanent employee under Section 3 of Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishment (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workman) Act, 1981. Hence for all these reasons, the petitioner prays this Tribunal to pass an award favouring the concerned employee.

4. But as against this, the Respondent in his counter statement contended the petitioner union cannot represent an ID in respect of Sri P. Jayabal who is a handling and transport contract worker and he cannot become a member of the union as per Clause 5 of the Bye-laws of the Union. The FCI has not appointed the concerned employee, Sri P. Jayabal in any post. Further, there is no such post as Scavenger in the FCI. Sri P. Jayabal was engaged as Casual Labour and he was paid then and there for the work done by him. Furthermore, Sri P. Jayabal is appointed under handling and transport contractor and he is being paid

only through handling and transport contractor for his work. This petition is liable to be dismissed for non-joinder of parties since the contractor has not been impleaded a party to the claim. The handling and transport contractor have issued I.D. cards to the concerned employee as their worker and he is working only under the handling and transport contractor. Further, the handling and transport contractor has also remitted EPF in respect of the concerned employee for the period from April 2000 to May 2001 and he was also a member of the FCI Loading and Unloading Association, Salem. The Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 is not applicable to the concerned employee since he was never engaged by FCI as direct employee at any time and he is only a labour under the handling and transport contractor. Engaging contract labour at Salem Food Storage Depot of the Respondent is not prohibited and the contractor engaged by the Respondent is also in possession of valid licence. Only FCI employees appointed casually or temporarily or on daily wage basis as per the Regulation 9 of the FCI Staff Regulation, 1971 can approach for regularization of services. Since the concerned employee has worked under handling and transport contractor, he cannot raise an Industrial Dispute for regularization of service. Even though the petitioner union alleged some of the Officers recommended for the regularization of the concerned employees, the said communication is against the instructions from the Headquarters and therefore the concerned employees cannot base the communication for his claim of regularization. The FCI has not issued any Appointment Order to the concerned employees and FCI has got separate rules and regulations for recruitment for their staff. Hence, for all these reasons the Respondent prays that the claim may be dismissed with their costs.

5. Again the petitioner in his rejoinder has alleged that Sri P. Jayabal is the member of the petitioner union as he is an employee of the FCI and the Respondent themselves have admitted that the concerned employee was directly employed by FCI from April 1984 to December 1995. Therefore, he cannot be unilaterally termed as contract employee by the Respondent Management. Further, the Respondent are estopped from raising the plea of locus standi. When the Respondent wanted to convert a FCI employee to a contract employee, there is a duty cast upon the Respondent to comply with Section 9A of the Industrial Disputes Act. Therefore, any change which is sought to be made without complying with Section 9A is void and the concerned employees continues to be the employee of the Respondent Corporation. Therefore, he is entitled to be regularized in the service. The entire control and supervision is exercised only by the Respondent and the alleged contractor who is only a name lender has no necessity to the present I.D. The Handling and Transport Contract Agreement does not provide for engagement of Scavenger/Sweeper for

office purposes, hence the claim of the Respondent that the concerned employee was engaged through handling and transport contractor is without any substance. Since, the concerned employee was engaged by FCI as Casual Labour, which is admitted by the Respondent and so long his status is not altered in a manner known to law, he has got a right to be regularized in the service. The communication between Asstt. Manager, Depot, Salem and the District Manager, Coimbatore is not a confidential document and the same is with regard to the concerned employee. Further, if there is any violation of the Headquarter's instructions, it is for the Respondent to take appropriate action against the official and on that score they cannot deny the right accrued to the concerned employee under the statutory provisions. Hence, for all these reasons, he prays and an award may be passed in favour of the concerned employee.

Points for determination are :

- (i) Whether the demand of the FCI Employee's Union for regularization of the services of Sri P. Jayabal, Scavenger, FCI, Salem is justified ?
- (ii) To what relief the workman is entitled to ?

Point No. 1

6. On behalf of the petitioner union, the concerned employee, Sri P. Jayabal was examined as WW1 and on the side of the petitioner, 10 documents W1 to W10 were marked and on the side of the Respondent, one Sri R. Marimuthu viz. the Manager of the Respondent Depot at Salem was examined as MW1 and on the side of the Respondent, Ex. M1 to M19 were marked.

7. The argument for the learned counsel of the petitioner is that it is admitted by the Respondent Management that they have engaged the concerned employee, Sri P. Jayabal as a Scavenger from May 1994 till 1995. Though, they alleged that he was appointed only as a casual employee on daily wage basis, subsequently, they cannot treat him as contract labour under a contractor which is vehemently opposed by the Supreme Court and he relied on the ruling reported in 1985, 2 LLJ, Page 4, Workman of the Food Corporation of India Vs. Food Corporation of India wherein the bench of three judges of the Supreme Court has held once some of the workmen became workmen of the corporation, it is not open to the corporation to induct a contractor and treat its workmen as workmen of the contractor. Basing on this ruling of the Supreme Court, the learned counsel of the petitioner argued that if once the Respondent Management has admitted that the concerned employee was engaged as a casual labour directly under the Respondent, they cannot treat the workman or induct a contractor in his place and treat the workman as contract workman. He further argued though the Respondent in this case has argued that the

concerned employee was an employee under Handling and Transport Contractor, the handling and transport is only for handling and transporting the goods of the FCI and there is no clause in the agreement with reference to cleaning and scavenging the premises. Under such circumstances, even assuming for argument sake that the concerned employee is a contract worker under the handling and transport contractor and when there is no clause in the agreement to say about the scavenging work, the concerned employee cannot be appointed as a contract worker under the handling and transport contractor and the said agreement in only sham and nominal and only to refuse the benefits accrued to the concerned employee, the said agreement was introduced and therefore on any ground the Respondent cannot dispute the right of the concerned employee that he has worked as a Scavenger directly from the year 1994 and he is entitled to regularization in the service of the Respondent Management. He further argued that the petitioner has alleged in the claim statement and also in the evidence that his work is a perennial one and the activities in the godown are perennial in nature and the storage and distribution of the food grains takes place throughout the year. This statement of the concerned employee has not been disputed by the Respondent in the counter statement nor in the evidence adduced by MW1. Therefore, when complex in Salem has got a storage capacity of 25,000 MT and since more than 6 permanent employees are working in the complex, the scavenging and cleaning of the office and godown was absolutely a necessity and it was also written by the Asstt. Manager, Salem to the District Manager, Coimbatore that the work of the concerned employee as a Scavenger is absolutely necessary and therefore he has recommended for his regularization in the services. Under such circumstances, the statement given by the concerned employee that his work is perennial in nature is to be accepted. Further, under such circumstances, the Respondent Management cannot deny the statutory right given to the concerned employee on the ground that he is only engaged as casual labour or on contract labour and therefore the petitioner is entitled to the relief of regularization in this case.

8. But, as against, this, the learned counsel of the Respondent contended after the full bench of the Supreme Court has decided in SECRETARY OF STATE OF KARNATAKA AND OTHER VS. UMA DEVI AND THREE OTHERS, 2006, 4 SCC, PAGE 1, "the petitioner cannot claim any regularization in the service on the ground that he has worked for more than 240 days in a continuous period of 12 months or he has worked for more than 8 years and therefore he is entitled for regularization. The Supreme Court in the above stated judgement has clearly stated that the casual labour/temporary employee do not have any right to regular/permanent public employment and further temporary, contractual, casual, ad hoc or daily wage public employment must be deemed

to be accepted by the employee fully knowing the nature of it and the consequences flowing from it. It further held that regular employment as per the constitutional scheme for public employment must be the rule, there is nothing in the constitutional scheme which prohibits the Union or the State Governments. Or their instrumentalities from engaging persons temporarily or on daily wage in spite of the constitutional scheme governing public employment, without following the required procedure, to meet the needs of the situation however consisting with the scheme of public employment, unless the appointment is in terms of relevant rules and after a proper competition amongst the qualified persons, the same would not confer any right on the appointee. Therefore, a contract comes to an end after the end of the contract, an appointment on daily wages or casual basis comes to an end when it is discontinued and a temporary appointment comes to an end on the expiry of its term. Therefore, no employee so engaged can claim to be made permanent on the expiry of their appointments. When regular vacancies in the posts are to be filled up a regular process of recruitment or appointment has to be resorted to as per the constitutional scheme and cannot be done in a haphazard manner based on patronage or other considerations". It also further held in that decision "long continuance of such employees on irregular basis in public employment cannot be considered as violating the rights under Arts. 14 and 16 of the Constitution." The Supreme Court held "such employees cannot claim that they are discriminated against vis-a-vis those who have been regularly recruited on the basis of relevant rules, or claim to be treated on a par with the latter" and relying on this judgement, he argued that in this case even assuming for argument sake without conceding that the concerned employee has worked continuously for number of years, on that ground he cannot claim regularization in the Respondent Management. Further, it is clear that there is no permanent post as Scavenger in the Respondent Management and therefore the petitioner cannot claim regularization in the post of Scavenger when there is no post at all in the Respondent Management. He also relied on the judgement quoted in 2006, 2, LLN, PAGE 89, BRANCH MANAGER, M.P. STATE AGRO DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. AND ANOTHER VS. S.C. PANDEY wherein the Supreme Court has held only because an employee has been working for more than 240 days that by itself would not confer any legal right upon him to be regularized in service and it further held "if an appointment is made contrary to the provisions of the statute the same would be void and the effect thereof would be that no legal right could be derived by the employee by reason thereof". He also relied on the ruling reported in 2006 C.D.J. S.C. 395, Municipal Council, Sujampur vs. Surinder Kumar, wherein the Supreme Court has held "it is not disputed that the appointment of the Respondent was not in a sanctioned post. Being a "State" within the

meaning of Art. 12 of the Constitution of India, the Appellant for the purpose of recruiting its employees was bound to follow the Recruitment Rules. Any recruitment made in violation of such rules is also in violation of constitutional scheme enshrined under the Arts. 14 and 16 of Constitution of India could be void in law". Similarly in a recent case, the Supreme Court has held "regularization, furthermore is not a mode of appointment, if appointment is made without following the rules, the same being a nullity, question of confirmation of the employee upon the expiry of purported period of probation would not arise and they have no legal right to continue in service". Basing on all these decisions of the Supreme Court, the learned counsel of the Respondent contended that in this case the concerned employee was not appointed to any post in the Respondent Management, it is admitted that no appointment order was issued to the concerned employee, it is also admitted that there is no regular post of Scavenger in the Respondent Management, under such circumstances, the concerned employee was only engaged as a casual on temporary basis, on that score he cannot claim any regularization in the Respondent Management. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel of the Respondent because the petitioner has not produced any document to show that the concerned employee was appointed to any post and it is also not shown before this Tribunal that there is a regular post of Scavenger in the Respondent Management. Under such circumstances, only because some of the lower officers have recommended for regularization of the concerned employee's service in the Respondent Management, the concerned employee cannot take advantage of this situation of the recommendation for regularization of his post when he has not established that his appointment is for a regular post and this Court cannot come to the rescue of the concerned employee for regularization. As such, I find this point against the petitioner.

Point No. 2

The next point to be decided in this case to what relief the concerned employee is entitled to ?

9. In view of my findings that the demand of the petitioner union for regularization of service of the concerned employee viz. P. Jayabal is not justified. I find the concerned employee is not entitled to any relief in this dispute.

10. Thus the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 21st September, 2007)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :—

For the I Party/
Petitioner : WW1 Sri P. Jayabal

For the II Party/
Mgmt. : MW1 Sri R. Marimuthu

Documents Marked :—**On the Petitioner's Side :—**

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	20-01-1995	Representation made by the concerned Workman
W2	20-06-1999	Representation made by the concerned Workman
W3	30-08-1999	Representation made by the concerned Workman
W4	08-02-1999	Office Memorandum
W5	23-03-1999	Office Memorandum
W6	26-04-1999	Letter of Asstt. Manager
W7	02-06-1999	Letter of Asstt. Manager
W8	23-10-1999	Dispute raised before Conciliation Officer
W9	29-11-1999	Counter filed before the Conciliation Officer
W10	12-01-2000	Reply filed by the union

For the II Party Management

Ex. No.	Date	Description
Ex. M1	17-11-2003	Fax message from FCI, Delhi Hqrs. to all Zonal Managers, Sr. Regional Mgrs., Executive Director (Engg.), Principal, CTI, FCI, Gurgaon
Ex. M2	—	Copy of the FCI staff regulations 1971 regarding post under General Administration Cadre
Ex. M3	—	Bye-laws of FCI Employees Union
Ex. M4	—	List of workers engaged by M/s. National Lorry Transport H&T Contractor 1993—95

Ex. No.	Date	Description
Ex. M5	04-01-1997	List of workers furnished by Chandru brothers, H&T Contractor
Ex. M6	—	Monthly EPF statement for October 2000 Paid by H&T Contractor, Sri Chakravarthy Enterprises
Ex. M7	—	Monthly EPF statement for August, 2001 paid by H&T Contractor, V. Sathiyarayanan.
Ex. M8	25-09-2001	List of workers engaged by V. Sathiyarayanan, H&T Contractor
Ex. M9	—	Xerox copy of the Identity Card issued to P. Jayabal by Sri Chakravarthy Enterprises, H&T Contractor
Ex. M10	—	Xerox copy of the Identity Card issued by H&T Contractor V. Sathiyarayanan to P. Jayabal
Ex. M11	25-09-2001	Licence issued to P. Sathiyarayanan for engaging Contract Labour
Ex. M12	1999-2000	EPF Contribution List by the Contractor
Ex. M13	2000-2001	EPF Contribution List by the Contractor
Ex. M14	2004-2005	EPF Contribution List by the Contractor
Ex. M15	—	Acknowledgement by P. Jayabal regarding EPF A/c for 2004-2005
Ex. M16	October 2003	Wage Register maintained by the Contractor
Ex. M17	April 2004	Wage Register maintained by the Contractor
Ex. M18	August 2004	Wage Register maintained by the Contractor
Ex. M19	—	Employment Card issued by the Contractor to P. Jayabal for 2005—2007

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 454.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार गोलुकडीह ओ. सी. पी. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (सं.-II), धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 3/2006) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11-02-2008 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/386/2001-आई आर (सी-I)]
स्नेह लता जवास, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 11th February, 2008

S.O. 454.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947(14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 3/2006) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court (C-II), Dhanbad now as shown in the annexure in Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Golukdih OCP and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 11-2-2008.

[No. L-20012/386/2001-IR (C-I)]
SNEH LATA JAWAS, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD****PRESENT :**

Shri Nagendra Kumar, Presiding Officer

In the matter of Complaint under Section 33A of the
I.D. Act, 1947

[Arising out of Ref. No. 295 of 2001, Ministry's Order
No. L-20012/386/2001-IR (C-I), dated 7-11-2001]

COMPLAINT NO. 3 OF 2006**PARTIES :**

S/Shree Raj Kendra Ram & Ram Gati Mistri,
workmen of Golukdih O.C.P., P.O. Jharia, Distt.
Dhanbad ...Complainants

Versus

Project Officer/Agent Golukdih OCP, P.O. Jharia,
Dhanbad and another ...Opp. Parties

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the Complainants : Mr. S. C. Gaur,
Advocate

On behalf of the Opp. Parties : Mr. R. N.
Ganguly,
Advocate

State : Jharkhand

Industry : Coal

Dated, Dhanbad, the 31st January, 2008

AWARD

This is a Complaint under Section 33A of the I.D. Act, 1947 filed by the complainants named above against the opposite parties mentioned above.

In course of hearing of the instant Complaint petition the representative of the complainants by filing a petition submitted that the complainants are not willing to proceed with the hearing of the case and desire to withdraw the same. No objection raised by the representative on behalf of the opposite parties.

Since the complainants have expressed their willingness not to proceed with the hearing of this case and as no objection raised on behalf of the opp. parties, the complaint petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

NAGENDRA KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 455.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 32/2006) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11-2-2008 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/215/2005-आई आर (बी-I)]
अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 11th February, 2008

S.O. 455.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947(14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 32/2006) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chennai, as shown in the Annexure. in Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 11-2-2008.

[No. L-12012/215/2005-IR (B-1)]
AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI**

Tuesday, the 30th October, 2007

PRESENT :

K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 32/2006

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (i) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their Workman]

BETWEEN

Sri M. Saravanan
40/6, Sarawathi Illam, E.B. Colony
Maharajanagar,
Tirunelveli-626011 1st Party/Petitioner

AND

The Asstt. General Manager (Reg. III)
State Bank of India,
Zonal Office,
Dr. Ambedkar Road,
Madurai-2 2nd Party/Respondent

APPEARANCE :

For the 1st Party/Petitioner : Sri R.
Arumugam

For the 2nd Party/Management : Sri V. R.
Gopalarathnam

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-12012/215/2005-IR(B-I) dated 23-05-2006 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

The Schedule mentioned in that order is :

"Whether the punishment if dismissal from service imposed on Sri M. Saravanan by the Management of State Bank of India, Tirunelveli is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to ?"

2. After the receipt of Industrial Dispute, this Tribunal has numbered it as ID 32/2006 and issued notices to both sides. Both sides entered appearance through their advocates and filed their claim and counter statement respectively.

3. The allegations in the Claim Statement are briefly as follows :

The petitioner joined in the services of Respondent Bank as Clerk/Cashier/Typist w.e.f. 01-06-1992 and he has put in more than 12 years of unblemished record of service. While so, in April 2002, he was elected as Unit Secretary in State Bank's Staff Union (CC) of Sankarankoil Branch but some of the staff who did not bear this and

adopted in different attitude towards to him and spread wrong and false news about him to the higher ups. While so, he was placed under suspension dated 22-08-2002 alleging that he had committed some irregularities/lapses. The Respondent also gave a complaint to the Police against the petitioner but after enquiry the Police have closed the complaint on 07-10-2002. The vigilance of the Respondent Bank had made an elaborate enquiry and they have also recorded statement from the staff of Sankaranayinarkoil branch. He was issued a memo dated 05-03-2003 to submit his explanation for certain alleged lapses in discharge of his duties as Cashier. The first allegation is that he issued counterfoils on 11 days and not credited the entire amount on 7 occasions and credited the entire amount on 4 occasions and credited lesser amount on 4 occasions and thus misappropriated the amount of Rs. 4,45,340. Subsequently, on 08-08-2002, he obtained two withdrawal slips from Smt. Rajeswari, one for Rs. 10,000 and another for Rs. 15,000 and he paid himself Rs. 25,000 to her when her actual balance in her SB Account was Rs. 13,636.46 only and thus he misappropriated Rs. 15,000 and he failed to account Rs. 10,700. Thirdly on 07-02-2002 when one Sri K. S. Bheema Raj handed over the amount of Rs. 10,700 towards gold loan account, he has failed to account the same and thus misappropriated that amount. Though, the petitioner has submitted his explanation, the Respondent Management has not accepted his explanation and ordered a departmental enquiry. The Enquiry Officer conducted the enquiry without following any procedure and submitted a report holding that charges 1 & 2 alone were proved and the Charge No. 3 was not proved. The Disciplinary Authority proposed a punishment of dismissal and called upon him to attend the personal hearing. After attending the personal hearing, the Disciplinary Authority by order dated 18-06-2004 dismissed him from service. Even though, the petitioner preferred an appeal, the Disciplinary Authority has rejected his appeal. After that, the petitioner raised a dispute before the labour authorities and after the failure of conciliation, the Government has referred this dispute for adjudication. In the enquiry, the procedure adopted by the Enquiry Officer is totally illegal and against the well written normal procedure. Hence, the whole enquiry is not fair and proper. Even though, the Presenting Officer was not cited as witness in the list enclosed and even inspite of that, the Presenting Officer deposed in the enquiry against the petitioner that too after seeing that evidence from PW-I to PW-10 are not enough to arrive a conclusion. Thus, the Enquiry Officer acted in a biased manner allowed the Management representative to put

leading questions to the witnesses and elicited the answers in favour of the Management. Thus, the whole enquiry is vitiated and the enquiry is not fair and proper. The Enquiry Officer is biased and his findings are also perverse and one-sided. In this case, the Branch Manager gave a Police complaint similar and identical to the chargesheet to the Inspector of Police on 04-10-2002. After the enquiry, the Police have dropped the complaint without any further action. Even though the petitioner the Chennai Head Office has asked the report submitted by the Police Authorities, which was refused by the Management. Thus, a vital documentary evidence was hidden purposely and with an ulterior motive. The charge against the petitioner is that he has misappropriated a large amount of customer's money but the alleged customer did not make any written or oral complaint against the petitioner. There is no prejudice caused to the bank by the petitioner. None of the customers who were examined in the domestic enquiry have deposed against the petitioner. Thus, the findings given by the Enquiry Officer is solely on mere extraneous grounds and not based on oral or documentary evidence. Thus, the Respondent Management predetermined to sent out the petitioner from service. Even though, the Appellate Authority without applying its mind has passed an illegal order, the Respondent Management has also shown discrimination to the petitioner when another employee, Sri A. Esakkimuthu who was issued the charge sheet on the same and identical charges has not imposed any punishment and subsequently was also given promotion which shows that the petitioner was victimized for his involvement in trade union activity and he belongs to the opposite group. The petitioner has never acted prejudicial to the interests of the bank. Anyhow, this Tribunal has got enough powers to interfere and set aside the punishment of removal from service. Hence for all these reasons, he prays this Tribunal to pass an award directing the Respondent Management to reinstate him with continuity of service, with full back-wages and attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent in his statement alleged that the petitioner while working as Assistant (Account/Cash) in Sankaranayinarkoil Branch of the Respondent Bank has committed serious misconducts. He issued counterfoils to M/s. Peer Mohammed Rowther on 11 occasions on various dates but he did not credit the entire amount received by him from the customer to the account of the customer on 7 occasions and credited lesser amount on 4 occasions and similarly on 08-08-2002 when one Smt. Rajeshwari came to the bank to withdraw Rs. 25,000 from her SB A/c., the petitioner obtained two

withdrawals from Smt. Rajeshwari, one for Rs. 10,000 and another for Rs. 15,000 when her balance in her account was only Rs. 13,636.46. The petitioner on that date had paid Rs. 25,000 to Smt. Rajeshwari by withdrawing a sum of Rs. 10,000 from Rajeshwari's account from the Teller Counter and paid Rs. 15,000 out of the withdrawal from his own account on the same date. Thus, it was noted that the petitioner has misappropriated Rs. 15,000 received by the petitioner for crediting into SB A/c. of Smt. Rajeshwari on earlier occasion. Thirdly, on 07-02-2002 while the petitioner served as Assistant (Cash), one Sri K. S. Bheema Raj, a gold loan borrower handed over Rs. 10,700 to the petitioner for crediting the same into his gold loan account towards interest payment, the petitioner has not deposited the same in customer's account and misappropriated the said amount. Since the explanation given by the petitioner are not satisfactory, an enquiry was ordered to be conducted against him. In the departmental proceedings, the petitioner was given adequate opportunity and was permitted to be represented by a defence representative and the enquiry was conducted in a fair and proper manner by complying with the principles of natural justice. After following all the procedures, the Disciplinary Authority proposed a punishment of dismissal without notice by his order dated 30-03-2004 and after giving a personal hearing, the Disciplinary Authority after considering all materials imposed the punishment of dismissal without notice. Aggrieved by the said order, the petitioner preferred an appeal to the Appellate Authority, the Appellate Authority after considering all materials placed before him concurred with the Disciplinary Authority's order and confirmed the punishment. It is false to allege that the procedure adopted by the Enquiry Officer was totally illegal or against the well written normal procedure. It is also false to say that the Enquiry Officer in a biased manner allowed the Management representative to put leading questions to the witnesses. Since in the enquiry proceedings, the Respondent Management did not rely on any police report, they have not given the copy of the same to the petitioner. The act of misappropriation was a serious misconduct and as such the bank has every right to take departmental proceedings against the petitioner and the misconducts alleged and proved against the petitioner were certainly prejudicial to the interests of the bank. When certain discrepancies surfaced in respect of operations in the accounts, it was incumbent upon the Respondent to investigate and inquire and there was or is no necessity for the account holder or customer to lodge a complaint. Though, the petitioner alleged that the Enquiry Officer has admitted the Xerox copies as exhibits and since the Evidence Act is strictly not applicable to the departmental proceedings, admitting the Xerox copies as exhibits and relying on them in conjunction with other materials would be proper and justified. Though, the petitioner alleged that some of the witnesses were belonged to opposite group

and hence deposed false evidence against him, such allegations are an afterthought and it cannot be said that the enquiry report is perverse for the reasons alleged by him. The findings of the Enquiry Officer on the charges made against him is correct and based on the preponderance of probabilities. Therefore, the action of the Respondent Management was not vindictive as alleged by the petitioner. For all these reasons, the Respondent prays that the Industrial Dispute may be dismissed with costs.

Points for determination are :

- (i) Whether the punishment of dismissal from service imposed on Sri M. Saravanan by the Respondent Management is legal and justified ?
- (ii) To what relief the petitioner is entitled to ?

Point No. 1

6. In this case, the petitioner was charge sheeted for the misconduct of misappropriation of the customer's amount. Both sides have not adduced any oral evidence. On the side of the petitioner, W1-W15 were marked which are the charge sheet and connected papers. As against this, on the side of the Respondent, M1 to M5 were marked which are the representation given by the petitioner for the proposed punishment and minutes of the personal hearing by the Appellate Authority and also the order of the Appellate Authority. Further the minutes of the enquiry proceedings and copies of the exhibits which were marked as M4 & M5. No doubt, 3 charges were framed against the petitioner in the domestic enquiry, out of these, the Enquiry Officer has held that only 2 charges have been proved against him. The first charge is that the petitioner while working as Asstt. (Accounts/Cash) in Sankaranainarkoil Branch of the Respondent Bank issued counterfoils to M/s. Peer Mohammed Rowther, one of the customers of the Respondent Bank on 11 occasions and he did not credit the entire amount received by him from the customer to the account of the customer 7 occasions and credited lesser amount on 4 occasions. The second charge is that when Smt. Rajeshwari, a customer of the Respondent Bank came to the Branch to withdraw Rs. 25,000 from her SB A/c., the petitioner obtained two withdrawals from the said customer, one for Rs. 10,000 and another for Rs. 15,000 even though the balance in her account was only Rs. 13,636.46 on that date. But, the said customer was paid Rs. 25,000 which was paid by the petitioner. It was learnt that the petitioner has misappropriated Rs. 15,000 received by him from the customer for crediting into her SB A/c. on earlier occasions. On the side of the Management, 10 witnesses were examined and on consideration of the entire evidence in that case the Enquiry Officer has held that these charges have been proved against the petitioner.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the enquiry conducted by the Enquiry Officer is not

fair and proper and no opportunity was given to the petitioner to cross-examine the witnesses examined on the side of the prosecution. Further, the copy of the main document have not been provided to the petitioner even though they were asked by the concerned employee. It is his further contention that though charges have been framed against the petitioner, it was admitted that the no oral or written complaint was made against the petitioner by the alleged customers. Under such circumstances, there is no satisfactory evidence to show the alleged prejudice caused to the Bank. Therefore, the findings of the Enquiry Officer is perverse and one sided. And he further argued without prejudice to the preliminary issue namely that the enquiry is not fair and proper. He argued that the Enquiry Officer has not relied on the evidence which was favourable to the petitioner, when the petitioner contended that he has not issued any counterfoils, as alleged by the Management, it is bounden duty of the Management to prove the fact that the petitioner has issued 11 counterfoils after receiving the amount from the customer. He further argued that one Mr. Jinna, the partner of M/s. Peer Mohammed Rowther was examined on the side of the Management as third witness and he deposed that somebody phoned to him that amount was not available for the cheque presented to the Bank issued by them and he personally came to the branch and got the statement of account and when comparing the statement and his challans, there was some difference. Subsequently, he handed over the challan book and asked them to verify and he further stated that when the challan book was returned to him in the evening, the Bank informed about the clearance of the cheque and the variation challans were missing and new challans was there for the variation amount. This witness did not make any specific allegation against the petitioner. Even before the Police, he has not given any statement against the petitioner. As such there is no specific complaint against the petitioner, either by the customer or by any documents. Under such circumstances, the Enquiry Officer has relied on the alleged 11 counterfoils which are Xerox copies of the counterfoils and when the originals have not been produced before the enquiry and when no reason was said for not producing the originals, the Enquiry Officer ought not to have marked the counterfoils. But on the other hand, he has marked the Xerox copies of the counterfoils and relied on the case from the counterfoils, which is illegal. therefore, the findings of the Enquiry Officer are perverse.

8. But on the other hand, the learned counsel for the Respondent contended that it is false to allege that the enquiry was not held in a fair and proper manner. In the departmental proceedings, the petitioner was given adequate opportunity and was permitted to represent by a defence representative. The enquiry was conducted in a fair and proper manner by following the principles of natural justice. No doubt, the reports of the Police and

copies of the statement recorded by them was not given to the petitioner but in the enquiry proceedings, the Respondent did not rely on any such report or statement made to the Police. Under such circumstances, it cannot be said that vital documentary evidence was hidden purposely and with ulterior motive as alleged by the petitioner. When certain discrepancies surfaced in respect of operations in the accounts it was incumbent on the Respondent Management to investigate and enquire and there was or is no necessity for the account holder or customer to lodge a complaint. In this case when the customer of the branch has given a cheque and when there is no amount in the account of the customer, the bank should investigate the said circumstances that the challans given by the petitioner to the said customer. No doubt, the Enquiry Officer has relied on the Xerox copies of the challans produced by the Management but on the other hand it is only given by the customer to the bank. Further, it is well settled, the Evidence Act is not applicable in the strict sense to the departmental proceedings and therefore it cannot be contended that the Xerox copies cannot be relied as evidence by the Enquiry Officer in the departmental proceedings. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. In this case, it is not the case of the petitioner that the signature found in the challans were not of his and it is also not the case of the petitioner that the customer has not given the Xerox copies of the counterfoils of the challans. Under such circumstances, I find there is no substance in the contention of the petitioner that there is no opportunity given to the petitioner in the domestic enquiry and I find the allegation that the findings given by the Enquiry Officer is perverse. No doubt, the learned counsel for the petitioner argued the reliance placed by the Enquiry Officer on the documents produced by the Management is not proper. I find here again that there is no point in the contention because it is well settled, a finding cannot be described to be perverse merely because it is possible to take a different view on the evidence, nor can a finding be called perverse because in certain matters the line of reasoning adopted by the Enquiry Officer is not very cogent or logical and it is also well settled only in a case where the findings or fact is based on no legal evidence and the conclusion is one to which no reasonable man would come, it would be a case of perversity and not of reappraisal. In this case, the Enquiry Officer after considering the entire evidence of the witnesses and the documents produced before him has come to a conclusion that the charges framed against the petitioner has been proved. No doubt, the learned counsel for the petitioner alleged that some of the witness who have deposed in the domestic enquiry have belonged to opposite group and they have given a false evidence against the petitioner but there is no proof or satisfactory evidence that they belonged to opposite group and his allegation was not made before the Disciplinary Authority or the Appellate

Authority and as such I find this allegation was made only as an afterthought to prejudice the mind of the Court.

9. The learned counsel for the petitioner further shown some of the inconsistencies in the evidence of the witnesses but I find they are filmy and they will not vitiate the enquiry. With regard to the second charge the learned counsel for the petitioner contended the second charge is based on assumption and presumption and not based on any oral or documentary evidence. Even in this case, the said Smt. Rajeshwari have not given any complaint against the petitioner or any other person. It is admitted that the Respondent Bank has given a complaint with regard to this in the Police and the Police have after enquiry has closed the case and given report to the Bank. Even before the Police, the said Smt. Rajeshwari, the customer has stated that there is no discrepancy in her SB A/c and the petitioner is not at all connected or involved in any transaction in the bank. In spite of this report and in spite of the report of the Vigilance Officers, the Respondent Bank has framed that the charges against the petitioner to victimize him. He further argued, it is the petitioner's case that on 08-08-2002, he has not obtained any withdrawal from the said Smt. Rajeshwari from her and he was worked in the establishment seat and has not paid any amount to Smt. Rajeshwari on 08-08-2002. Under such circumstances, the Management has to prove the allegations made against him either by cross-examining Smt. Rajeshwari in the enquiry or to produce a written complaint given by her. But they have not done either of these things. On the other hand, the petitioner examined her as his witness in the enquiry and elicited that she came to the bank on 08-08-2002 and took only Rs. 10,000 from her account and it is her categorical statement that she has not given two withdrawal slips to the petitioner. Under such circumstances, the findings given by the Enquiry Officer that the charges framed against the petitioner, is without any substance and it clearly shows that the Enquiry Officer is perverse and cannot be relied upon. Here again, I find some force in the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner. But, on consideration of the entire evidence in this case and consideration of the reasoning given by the Enquiry Officer, I find there is no substance in the contention of the learned counsel of the petitioner.

10. Then again, the learned counsel for the petitioner contended the Respondent Management has also shown discrimination to the petitioner when especially another employee was given a lesser punishment and promotion for the same allegation which clearly established that the petitioner was victimized for his involvement in Trade Union activities and he argued the whole action of the Respondent Management is nothing but a vindictive action and the petitioner has not committed any act prejudice to the interests of the Bank. But again, I find no point in the contention of the learned

counsel for the petitioner because the petitioner has not established before this Tribunal that any other employee has been charged for same allegation and he was given a lesser punishment. Further, he has not established before this Tribunal that the charges framed against the alleged clerk or official are the same. Under such circumstances, the allegation of the petitioner is without any substance. Therefore, I find there is no point in the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the findings of the Enquiry Officer are perverse and one-sided. Under these circumstances, the learned counsel for the Respondent contended the Respondent Bank has raised the preponderance of probabilities on the petitioner for the misconduct of misappropriation and the misconduct of misappropriation is grave in nature which warranted only the major punishment. He further argued in this case, the allegations against the petitioner have been proved and the enquiry contended in a fair and proper manner and the principles of natural justice are duly complied with. As such, Tribunal cannot interfere in the punishment imposed on the petitioner. He further argued it is well settled by the Supreme Court and other High Courts in coming to the question of quantum of punishment, the Court should bear in mind the fact that it is not the amount of money that becomes primary factor for awarding punishment on the contrary it is loss of confidence which the primary factor to be taken into consideration. Under such circumstances, in this case, though the petitioner has paid the amount which he has temporarily misappropriated, the Respondent Bank has lost confidence in him. Under such circumstances, this Tribunal should not interfere in the award of punishment against the petitioner. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent. Therefore, I find this point against the petitioner.

Point No. 2

11. In view of my foregoing findings that the punishment of dismissal from service imposed on the petitioner by the Respondent Management is legal and justified. I find the petitioner is not entitled to any relief.

12. Thus, the reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 30th October, 2007)

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :

For the I Party/Petitioner : None

For the II Party/Management : None

Documents Marked :

On the Petitioner's side

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	22-08-2002	Memo issued by the Respondent
W2	—	Petitioner's Explanation
W3	05-03-2003	Memo issued by the Respondent
W4	11-03-2003	Petitioner's Explanation
W5	20-06-2003	Charge Sheet
W6	25-06-2003	Petitioner's Explanation
W7	13-11-2003	Petitioner's reply to E.O.
W8	06-02-2004	Enquiry Report
W9	03-03-2004	Petitioner's Explanation
W10	30-03-2004	Show cause notice
W11	08-04-2004	Petitioner's Explanation
W12	18-06-2004	Dismissal Order
W13	28-06-2004	Grounds of Appeal
W14	30-08-2004	Order in appeal.
W15	—	2A Petition filed before RLC

From the Management side :

Ex. No.	Date	Description
M1	—	Representation of the employee on proposed punishment
M2	29-07-2004	Minutes of the personal hearing given by the Appellate Authority
M3	28-08-2004	Order of Appellate Authority
M4	—	Minutes of Enquiry Proceedings
M5	—	Exhibits in Domestic Enquiry

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2008

क्र.अ. 456.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधक के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चैन्नई के पंचाद (संदर्भ संख्या 08/2006) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11-2-2008 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/143/2005-आई आर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 11th February, 2008

S.O. 456.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central

Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 08/2006) of Central Government Industrial Tribunal-Cum-Labour Court, Chennai, as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 11-02-2008.

[No. L-12012/143/2005-IR(B-I)]
AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Friday, the 30th November, 2007

PRESENT :

K. Jayaraman, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 8/2006

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of State Bank of India and their Workman]

BETWEEN

Sri K. Kalirajan : I Party/Petitioner

Vs.

The Dy. General Manager : II Party/Management
(Region-III)
State Bank of India,
Zonal Office No. 2,
Ambedkar Road,
Madurai-625002

APPEARANCE :

For the Petitioner : M/s. Balan Haridas,
R. Kamatchi Sundaresan

For the Management : Sri V. R. Gopalarathnam

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-12012/143/2005-IR(B-I) dated 23-01-2006 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

The schedule mentioned in that order is :

“Whether the punishment of dismissal from service without notice imposed against Sri K. Kalirajan, Assistant by State Bank of India, Madurai is legal and justified? If not to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. After the receipt of Industrial Dispute, this Tribunal has numbered it as ID 8/2006 and issued notices to both sides. Both sides entered appearance through their Advocates and filed their claim and counter statement respectively.

3. The allegations in the claim statement are briefly as follows :

The petitioner joined the Respondent Bank as Clerk-cum-Typist during 22-06-1981. During May 2001, he was promoted as Sr. Asstt. While so, the petitioner's wife has started a business along with petitioner's two brothers and her aunt. The business started is under the name and style M/s Venus Fireworks Industries at Panaiadipatty Village near Sivakasi town. They have availed the loan in the Tamil Nadu Industrial Investment Corporation and they also availed some credit facility from State Bank of India, Sattur branch and they have a current accounts with Sivakasi Town Branch. The petitioner had no part or role or interest whatsoever in the business. In Sivakasi Town Branch, the petitioner's brother-in-law, one Sri A. Jayachandran was working and he was suspended for some alleged misconduct which resulted in fraudulent withdrawal of funds. In that, it is mentioned Sri A. Jayachandran apart from other irregularities had used the current account with SBI, Sivakasi Town Branch in the name of Venus Fireworks Industries. The petitioner has nothing to do with any of the alleged fraudulent activities of Sri A. Jayachandran. While so, merely because the petitioner happened to be the brother-in-law of A. Jayachandran, Respondent Management decided to proceed against the petitioner also and he was suspended from service by an order dated 18-11-2002. At that time, he was worked at Rajapalayam branch. After the show cause notice, the petitioner has given explanation but not satisfied with the explanation the Respondent Bank issued a charge memo dated 07-06-2003. In that they have leveled 5 charges against the petitioner. The first charge was that the petitioner made false declaration as if he has no interest in the business of M/s Venus Fireworks Industries and the petitioner has given personal guarantee for the loan availed by the said industry without prior approval of the bank. The 2nd charge was that the petitioner has indirect control over the business of M/s Venus Fireworks Industries and it would amount to engage in trade and business without prior permission from the bank. The 3rd charge was the petitioner had connived with Sri A. Jayachandran in his fraudulent activities and he has knowledge about the clearing credit amount for other accounts that were diverted to the current account of Venus Fireworks Industries. The 4th charge was he had done certain transaction of high value in the current/savings bank account maintained by him in Sivakasi branch and the same are disproportionate to his own source of income. The 5th charge was even though the petitioner knew that the cash credit amount of M/s Venus Fireworks Industries,

he did not take steps to regularize the cash credit account at Sattur branch. Further, even a criminal proceeding against the petitioner for the charge mentioned in Charge No. 3 and it is also identical to the allegation made against him, the CBI who investigated the case has not included the petitioner in the chargesheet. In the domestic enquiry, even though the charges framed against the petitioner was not proved, the Enquiry Officer has submitted a report dated 08-05-2004 holding that the Charge Nos. 1, 2, 3 & 5 are proved and Charge No. 4 is partly proved. The findings of the Enquiry Officer is perverse, contrary to the evidence on record and without semblance of legal evidence. The Disciplinary Authority after issuing a 2nd show cause notice has proposed a penalty of dismissal without notice and on 31-08-2004, he has imposed a penalty of dismissal from service without notice. The enquiry conducted by the Respondent Management in hurried manner, without offering any reasonable opportunity to the petitioner to defend his case and it is in violation of principles of natural justice and even after the expiry of one year, the petitioner was not given full wages as subsistence allowance without any justification. The findings of the Enquiry Officer which based on surmises and conjectures and without any legal evidence and it is also a perverse finding. Though the petitioner has no interest in the unit, which was run by the petitioner's wife, the Enquiry Officer has given a finding that the petitioner has got interest in the said business. In the enquiry, no materials were placed to show that the petitioner had control over the unit and the petitioner was managing the affairs of the unit. No doubt, a Demand Draft of Rs. 35,000 was received by the petitioner's wife in her name, this DD was the amount due to Venus Fireworks Industries payable by a Gujarat dealer. Since the petitioner's wife did not have any account in her name, the petitioner credited this DD amount in his account after being duly authorised by the Asstt. General Manager. This is a stray incident of depositing a demand draft payable to his wife in the petitioner's account. This by no means would amount to engaging himself in the business activities of his wife. With reference to the 3rd charge also in the enquiry, no material was placed and the Enquiry Officer has given a finding that the petitioner is guilty of charge on the ground that the letters meant for Venus Fireworks Industries were delivered to the petitioner's wife at his residence. Further, the Enquiry Officer, in a most perverse manner held this charge that the petitioner had a role in the fraudulent activities of Sri A. Jayachandran when there is no material placed in the enquiry to show that he had a role to play in the alleged fraudulent activities. The bank thus being in fault has foisted those charges against the petitioner which is to make him a scapegoat to cover up its failures. The Enquiry Officer merely on suspicion has held that the charges were proved against the petitioner. By no stretch of imagination, a single entry in his account which belongs to his wife be

termed to be disproportionate to his known source of income, when in all terms the petitioner explains that the amount does not belong to him. When it is not his duty to watch the cash credit account of the Venus Fireworks Industries and its current account maintained in the branches which were not in his control, the Enquiry Officer has come to a perverse finding that the petitioner had knowledge about the transaction of the unit. Thus, without any basis and without any legal evidence in the enquiry, the Enquiry Officer has held the charges have been proved in a most perverse manner. The Disciplinary Authority also without considering all the objections made by the petitioner and without considering the unblemished past records of the petitioner and without applying the mind to the charges have imposed the extreme punishment of dismissal from service without notice. The Appellate Authority also in a most perverse manner without applying its mind to the various grounds raised by the petitioner confirmed the order of the Disciplinary Authority. When there was no charge of collusion or no mala fide intention or loss earned to the bank, the Appellate Authority mentioned in his order as if the irregularities committed by the petitioner had resulted in a loss of Rs. 50 lakhs to the bank. Therefore, the punishment imposed by the Disciplinary Authority which is confirmed by the Appellate Authority is illegal, arbitrary, contrary to law and in violation of principles of natural justice and erroneous. Further, this Tribunal has got every power to interfere with the quantum of punishment by invoking Section - IIA of the I.D. Act. hence, for all these reasons, the petitioner prays this Tribunal to declare that the punishment imposed by the Disciplinary Authority is illegal, arbitrary and consequently direct the Respondents to reinstate him in service with full back wages and with attendant benefits.

4. As against this, the Respondent contended in his counter statement that the petitioner filed a Writ Petition before the Hon'ble High Court, Chennai seeking inter alia for direction to the Respondents not to proceed with the disciplinary proceedings in respect of the charge dated 07-06-2003 till the criminal proceedings finally disposed of. The said WP is still pending before the Hon'ble High Court. Without prejudice to this contention, the Respondent contended that the petitioner while serving as Assistant at Sivakasi Town Branch was reported to have committed certain irregularities and 5 charges framed against him. The petitioner has been engaging himself in trade and business outside the scope of his duties without obtaining permission and he has with full knowledge with his relatives, clandestinely diverted to the current account of M/s Venus Fireworks Industries at Sivakasi Town Branch, the petitioner has connived with Sri A. Jayachandran, Asstt., Sivakasi Town Branch in his fraudulent activities to cheat the bank and an enquiry was ordered to be conducted against him. The Enquiry Officer

after full opportunity to the petitioner has given a finding that the Charge Nos. 1, 2, 3 & 5 are proved and Charge No. 4 is partly proved against him. Since, the enquiry was conducted as per the principles of natural justice and full opportunity was given to the petitioner as well as witnesses to support his case and after examining all the records, the enquiry officer has come to a conclusion the above charges were proved against the petitioner and the enquiry report would clearly reveal the role of the petitioner and his total involvement in the said business. The charges leveled against the petitioner are in accordance with the service conditions and any breach of instructions would amount to misconduct. It is admitted by the petitioner that he has not obtained any permission from the Appropriate Authority for executing a guarantee for a loan of Rs. 7.90 lakhs availed by M/s Venus Fireworks Industries favouring Tamil Nadu Industrial Investment Corporation (TNIC) and as per the Rules of Conduct & Discipline, an employee of the bank may not except with the prior permission of the Managing Director or Chief General Manager, guarantee in his private capacity the pecuniary obligation of another person or agree to indemnify in such capacity another person from loss, except with the previous permission of the Appropriate Authority. While so, the petitioner without obtaining prior permission and without disclosing the fact, executed the guarantee in favour of TNIC will amount to concealment of facts. Only due to his personal involvement in the affairs of the firm M/s Venus Fireworks Industries, he has received a DD amount of Rs. 35,000 sent by a Gujarat customer and credited the same in his personal current account maintained by him in the branch. All the facts prove that the petitioner has been engaging himself in the trade and business outside the scope of his duties without obtaining prior approval from the bank. Only on the basis of preponderance of probabilities the Enquiry Officer rightly held the charges framed against the petitioner has been proved. The petitioner is fully aware of the fact that clearing credits amount for other accounts were credited to the account of M/s Venus Fireworks Industries and therefore it is established that the petitioner connived with Sri A. Jayachandran in his fraudulent activities to cheat the bank and he has acted prejudicial and detrimental to the interests of the bank. Thus, it has established the petitioner has indirect control over the affairs of M/s Venus Fireworks Industries and therefore it cannot be said that the Enquiry Officer has given a perverse finding and the Enquiry Officer has rightly held that the charges 1, 2, 3 & 5 are proved and charge no. 4 is partly proved. In banking industry trust and confidence are very much required and lack of integrity on the part of the employee is viewed very seriously. In this case, the circumstances clearly show the petitioner's involvement in the business of M/s Venus Fireworks Industries which is outside the scope of his duties without obtaining prior permission from the authorities and therefore it cannot

be said that the punishment imposed upon the petitioner is illegal or unjustified. Hence for all these reasons the Respondent prays the claim may be dismissed with costs.

Points for determination are :

- (i) Whether the punishment of dismissal from service without notice imposed against the petitioner by the Respondent Bank is legal and justified ?
- (ii) To what relief the petitioner is entitled to ?

Point No. 1

5. In this case, the petitioner viz. Sri K. Kalirajan, Ex. Asstt. of State Bank of India, Madurai has questioned the order of dismissal from service without notice imposed on him by the Management. On behalf of the petitioner, 18 documents viz. Ex. W1 to Ex. W18 were marked and on the side of the petitioner no witness were examined. As against this, on the side of the Respondent, 4 documents Ex. M1 to Ex. M4 were marked and one O.P.G. Selvaraju, the Chief Manager (HRD) of State Bank of India, Madurai Zonal Office was examined as MW1. On behalf of the petitioner, the learned counsel for the petitioner contended one A. Jayachandran was suspended by the Sivakasi Town Branch, SBI on the ground of some alleged irregularities. The said Jayachandran is the brother-in-law of the petitioner. Merely because the petitioner happened to be the brother-in-law of petitioner, the Respondent decided to proceed against the petitioner also and he was also suspended from service by an order dated 18-11-2002 while he was worked in Rajapalayam branch of the Respondent Management has framed 5 charges against the petitioner in which they alleged the business started by the petitioner's wife and her brothers in the name and style viz. M/s Venus Fireworks Industries, Panayadipatti Village near Sivakasi was actually run by the petitioner and the petitioner has indirect control over the business of M/s Venus Fireworks Industries and it would amount to engaging himself in trade and business without obtaining prior permission from the bank. Thus, they have charge sheeted against him for the 5 charges. They are :

First Charge

(i) The first charge levelled against him that he made false declaration as if he has no interest in the business of Venus Fireworks Industries and he has given personal guarantee for the loan availed by the industry without prior approval of the bank. Under the bipartite settlement, there is no provision to the effect that an employee stand guarantee in any transaction and in this case when the issuance of guarantee was objected to by the bank, the petitioner offer to come out of the guarantee. The petitioner also obtained the permission and have also obtained administrative clearance from the bank that he

has no interest in the business of his wife and in such circumstances, it cannot be said that he has got interest in the business. But on the other hand, on behalf of the Respondent it is contended that an employee standing as guarantor involving financial obligations without obtaining prior approval from the appropriate authority is violation of the instructions of the bank and is a misconduct and the learned counsel for the Respondent relied on the "Rules of Conduct for Award Staff" which was marked as Ex. M4 wherein Para-1 of Vol. 1, Chapter-I of "Rules of Conduct" says "an employee of the Bank may not guarantee in his private capacity the pecuniary obligations of another person or agree to indemnify in such capacity another from loss, except with the previous permission of the Appropriate Authority" and Para-2 says "an employee guilty of infringing any of the provisions of Para-1 may render himself liable to dismissal from the service". The argument that the petitioner being an award staff cannot say that he has no knowledge about the rules and it is his admission that he has not obtained any prior permission from the authorities for being a guarantor for the finances. Under such circumstances, the findings given by the Enquiry Officer cannot be stated as perverse or illegal.

6. I find much force in the contention of the Respondent. When there is a specific rule in the Rules of Conduct for Award Staff, it cannot be said that he has no knowledge of the same, the learned counsel for the petitioner contended that this rule has not been quoted in the charge and therefore they cannot take advantage of the said rule and pass order that the petitioner has violated provisions of this rule.

7. Though, I find some force in the learned counsel for the petitioner, it cannot be said that the petitioner has no knowledge about conduct rules and he has stood as a guarantor. When the petitioner has no knowledge about cash credits and he stood as a guarantor without knowing the rules, his ignorance cannot be taken as a ruse for not obtaining the permission from the bank. Therefore, with regard to first charge, I come to a conclusion that the charge framed against the petitioner has been proved with satisfactory evidence.

Second Charge

(ii) The learned counsel for the petitioner then argued that there is no iota of evidence in the domestic enquiry that the petitioner has indirect control over the business of Venus Fireworks Industries. The findings given by the Enquiry Officer that the petitioner himself engaged in the trade and business without obtaining prior permission from the bank is without any substance and therefore, the findings given by the Enquiry Officer is perverse and without legal evidence. But here again, the learned counsel for the Respondent contended the

petitioner was well known to the customers of Venus Fireworks Industries and had also confirmed that the petitioner had been active with the affairs of the industry and he has routed through the business transactions of the industry in his personal current account which is clearly established the fact that he has indirect control over the business of Venus Fireworks Industries and it would amount engaging himself in trade & business without obtaining prior permission from the bank and therefore findings given by the Enquiry Officer cannot be questioned as perverse or illegal. But, though it is argued that the petitioner had indirect control over the business of Venus Fireworks Industries, it is only on the presumption, the Enquiry Officer has come to the conclusion. There is no direct evidence to show that the petitioner has involved in the business or control over the business merely because one transaction was routed through the petitioner's account, it cannot be said that the entire transactions of the industry were run by the petitioner and he has control over the business of the industry. As such, I find the findings of the Enquiry Officer is only on assumption and presumption and there is no satisfactory evidence that the petitioner has indirect control over the business of M/s Venus Fireworks Industries. Therefore, I find the findings given with regard to this charge is not legal.

Third Charge

(iii) Then again, the learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the 3rd charge against the petitioner was that he was fully aware of the credit amount for other accounts which was diverted to the current account of Venus Fireworks Industries and the petitioner connived with A. Jayachandran in his fraudulent activities and thus he has committed a misconduct. But here again though it is alleged that the petitioner has connived with A. Jayachandran in his fraudulent activities, in the domestic enquiry, there is no satisfactory evidence of the connivance between A. Jayachandran and the petitioner. Here again, I find the Enquiry Officer has come to the conclusion only on presumption that A. Jayachandran who is the brother-in-law of the petitioner must have connived with the petitioner. As such, there is not even iota of evidence to show that the petitioner has connived with A. Jayachandran in his fraudulent activities. As such, I here again find that the findings of the Enquiry Officer for the charge no. 3 is without any legal evidence.

Fourth Charge

(iv) Then the 4th charge levelled against the petitioner is that there had been certain transaction in Current/SB A/c maintained in Sivakasi branch of the Respondent Bank and the same are disproportionate to his known source of income and they alleged 4 transactions, the first transaction is for Rs. 54,000 and

the 2nd transaction is with reference to Rs. 23,800 and the 3rd transaction is for Rs. 35,000 and the 4th transaction is for Rs. 50,000 on different dates and they alleged at no stretch of imagination it can be said that these amounts are income proportionate to his known source. But in the enquiry, out of 4 transactions, 3 transactions viz. 1, 2 & 4th transactions are towards the disbursement of housing loan and personal loan by the bank to the petitioner. It is found that only the 3rd transaction of Rs. 35,000 was not the income to the known source of the petitioner. But the petitioner has given an explanation that this amount of Rs. 35,000 is the amount payable to the petitioner's wife and since the petitioner's wife has no account in the bank, with the permission of Asstt. General Manager, he has credited this amount in his account and he submitted that this amount was sent by a Gujarat customer to the industry in the name of his wife. There is no contra evidence that this amount was belonged to the petitioner alone but the Enquiry Officer of the Respondent Bank has come to a conclusion that this also belongs to the petitioner and he has got interest in the business but I find this is without any substance and there is no legal evidence to come to such a conclusion as such I find that this charge is not proved against the petitioner.

Fifth Charge

(v) Then again, the learned counsel for the petitioner contended the 5th charge framed against the petitioner that even though the petitioner knew cash credit account of Venus Fireworks Industries with Sattur branch and there were substantial transaction in current account of M/s Venus Fireworks Industries at Sivkasi Town Branch, the petitioner did not take steps to regularize the cash credit account at Sattur branch and thus acted prejudicial to the interests of the bank. The learned counsel for the petitioner argued even at the first instance the petitioner has clearly declared that he had no interest in the business and trade of Venus Fireworks Industries and therefore the question of taking steps to regularize the account with the SBI, Sattur branch will not arise at all. Further, the cash credit of Venus Fireworks Industries at Sattur branch and the current account of the said unit in Sivkasi Town branch has nothing to do with the petitioner's work in Sivkasi Main branch or at Rajapalayam branch. Further, it is not his duty to watch the cash credit account and current account of the said unit maintained in different branches which were not in his control. Further more, it is not part of his duty to follow up these accounts unless it is specifically assigned to him. Merely because the petitioner's wife is a partner in the unit does not make him liable either legally or morally to foresee the transactions. It is his further contention that the cash credit facility or the current account facility were not extended to the unit because of the petitioner's employment with the bank or because the

petitioner's wife was a partner in the unit. At the time of extending the cash credit facility or while opening the current account for the industry, no obligation has been put on the petitioner to foresee these accounts. Further more, in the domestic enquiry no materials were placed to show that the petitioner had knowledge about the transaction as alleged by them. In such circumstances, the Enquiry Officer without any basis had come to the conclusion that the petitioner was involved in the affairs of the unit and that the petitioner had full knowledge about the statement of cash credit account of the unit in Sattur branch. Therefore, without any legal evidence and without any materials and basis, the Enquiry Officer has given a conclusion that this charge framed against the petitioner has been proved. Therefore, the findings given by the Enquiry Officer is perverse and the petitioner has been punished for no fault on his part. It is his further contention, the petitioner has rendered 21 years of unblemished record of service and without considering his past records and without applying his mind to the charges and materials on record, the Disciplinary Authority also has imposed the extreme punishment of dismissal from service without notice and the Appellate Authority also in most perverse manner without applying his mind to the various grounds raised by the petitioner, confirmed the said order thus the whole thing is vitiated. The learned counsel for the petitioner vehemently argued that by invoking Section 11A of the I.D. Act, this Tribunal has to interfere with the quantum of punishment and this Tribunal has got every power to re-appreciate the evidence adduced in the domestic enquiry and therefore he prays that this Tribunal to declare that the order passed by the Disciplinary Authority and the Appellate Authority are illegal, arbitrary, contrary to law and in violation to the principles of natural justice and direct the Respondent to reinstate the petitioner with full back wages.

8. But as against this, the learned counsel for the Respondent contended even assuming for argument sake without conceding that out of 5 charges, 4 charges have not been proved against the petitioner since it is established in the first charge that the charge has been proved against him, this Tribunal as a revisional authority cannot set aside the order passed by the domestic tribunal and cannot set aside the punishment imposed on him. He argued interference with the quantum of punishment cannot be a routine matter. The punishment was imposed on the proved charges clearly establish that the Respondent Bank employee failed to discharge his duties with utmost integrity, honesty, devotion and diligence and his acts were prejudicial to the interests of the bank. Hence the punishment of dismissal was proportionate to the misconduct proved and the interference thereof was not warranted. It is his further argument in banking industry, trust and integrity need to be preserved by every employee. In this case, the petitioner has not discharged his duties

with diligence and integrity, under such circumstances, the argument that under Section-11A of the I.D. Act, the Court can interfere with the punishment is without any substance.

9. I find much force in the contention of the learned counsel for the Respondent because as I have already stated the petitioner has not obtained any prior permission to become a guarantor for the loan obtained by the industry and it is clearly established under Para-2 of "Conduct Rules", Vol.-1, Chapter-1 "if an employee guilty of infringing any of the provisions of Para-1 may render himself liable to dismissal from the service". Since the petitioner has violated the conduct rules, I find the findings given by the Enquiry Officer cannot be said as violative or perverse. Accordingly, I find though out of 5 charges, 4 charges have not been proved, charge no. 1 is clearly proved and therefore this Tribunal cannot interfere in the imposition of punishment made by the domestic tribunal. As such, I find this point against the petitioner.

Point No. 2

The next point to be decided to what relief the petitioner is entitled to ?

10. In view of my foregoing findings that the punishment of dismissal from service imposed by the Respondent bank against the petitioner is legal and justified, I find the petitioner is not entitled to any relief in this dispute.

11. Thus the reference is disposed of accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 30th November, 2007).

K. JAYARAMAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :

For the I Party/Petitioner : None

For the II Party/Management : MW1 Sri O.P.G. Selvaraju

Documents Marked :

From the Petitioner's side

Ex. No.	Date	Description
Ex.W1	18-11-2002	Suspension Order
Ex.W2	30-01-2003	Show Cause Notice
Ex.W3	27-02-2003	Explanation given by petitioner
Ex.W4	07-06-2003	Charge Memo

Ex. No.	Date	Description
Ex.W5	04-07-2003	Explanation to Charge Memo
Ex.W6	15-07-2003	Order appointing Enquiry Officer
Ex.W7	—	Enquiry Proceedings
Ex.W8	13-02-2004	Brief submitted by Presenting Officer
Ex.W9	19-03-2004	Defense brief submitted by petitioner
Ex.W10	—	Defense exhibits (DEX.1 to DEX.V)
Ex.W11	14-05-2004	Letter of Respondent Bank enclosing Enquiry Report
Ex.W12	10-06-2004	Comments on Enquiry Report
Ex.W13	08-07-2004	Second Show Cause Notice
Ex.W14	31-08-2004	Order of Dismissal
Ex.W15	21-09-2004	Appeal
Ex.W16	23-09-2004	Personal Hearing Notice
Ex.W17	25-10-2004	Submission before personal hearing
Ex.W18	09-11-2004	Order in Appeal

For the II Party/Management

Ex. No.	Date	Description
Ex.M1	07-06-2003	Charge Sheet
	08-05-2004	Enquiry Officer's Report
	—	Minutes of Enquiry Proceedings
	10-06-2004	Comments of Kalirajan on Enquiry Report
	31-08-2004	Record of personal hearing given by Disciplinary Authority
	31-08-2004	Order of Disciplinary Authority
	09-11-2004	Order of Appellate Authority
Ex.M2	02-12-2002	Letter of Tamil Nadu Industrial Investment Corporation Ltd. to State Bank of India, Sivakasi Branch.
Ex.M3	04-12-2002	Letter of Tamil Nadu Industrial Investment Corporation Ltd. to State Bank of India, Sivakasi Branch.
Ex.M4	—	Rules of conduct for Award Staff.

नई दिल्ली, 12 फरवरी, 2008

AWARD

का.आ. 457.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सेन्ट्रल फूड टेक्नोलोजिकल रिसर्च इंस्टिट्यूट के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नं.-II, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 803/2005) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-2-2008 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/114/1999-आई आर (डी यू)]

सुरेन्द्र सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 12th February, 2008

S.O. 457.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 803/2005) of Central Government Industrial Tribunal-Cum-Labour Court, No. II Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Central Food Technological Research Institute and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 12-02-2008.

[No. L-42012/114/1999-IR(DU)]
SURENDRA SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT-II, SECTOR 18-A,
CHANDIGARH**

Shri Kuldip Singh, Presiding Officer

Case I.D. No. 803/2005

Registered on : 06-09-2005

Date of Decision : 31-01-2008

Tehal Singh,
S/o Makhan Singh
R/o Dharam Kot Pattan,
Dera Baba Nanak,
Gurdaspur.

...Petitioner

Versus

The Head/Deputy Director,
Central Food Technological Research Institute,
Gill Road, Ludhiana-141001

...Respondent

APPEARANCE

For the Workman : Mr N. K. Sharma, Advocate

For the Management : Mr. I. P. Sidhu, Advocate

The parties continue to be absent. No witness for the workman is present. It is on record that the workman has not appeared in the case since August, 2006. Even on earlier dates he rarely appeared in person. His statement was recorded on 8th of Dec., 2005. He sought and was given further time to produce evidence but he produced none, for one reason or the other. He was given last opportunity to produce the evidence on 12th of Oct., 2006, but on the date fixed for the purpose he absented himself. On subsequent dates also he remained absent except on 9th of July, 2007, on which date also he appeared through counsel and not in person. He has failed to produce any more evidence.

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide their notification No. L-42012/114/99/IR(DU) dated 29th of Sept., 1999 desired to know "whether the action of the Management of Central Food Technological Research Institute, Ludhiana in terminating the services of Sh. Tehal Singh S/o Sh. Makhan Singh without paying him retrenchment compensation is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?" The workman by his statement of claim, affidavit and statement has claimed that he was engaged by the Management directly; and that he had served them from Nov., 1997 to 11th of Oct., 1999 i.e. for more than 240 days; and that the Management terminated his services without any notice or enquiry. They also did not pay him the wages for the notice period nor the retrenchment compensation. Thus his retrenchment was in violation of section 25-F of the Industrial Dispute Act, hereinafter to be referred as "Act." The Management has denied the claim made by the workman. According to them the workman was engaged by Messrs Security Detective System (India), the agency which was in contract with Management from 1st of Oct, 1997 to 30th of Sept. 1998. He was then engaged by Messrs NSAS, another agency which had provided services to the Management from 1st of Oct., 1998 to 30th of Sept., 1999. The management has thus denied the relationship of employee and employer between the parties.

The workman made the statement before this Tribunal and in his cross-examination he admitted the contents of his rejoinder in which he claimed that the Management had deducted GPF from his wages, but he has failed to produce any evidence that the GPF was deducted from the wages by the Management. It is the law that the GPF deducted is deposited with the Provident Fund Commissioner and if the claim of the workman was true he could call a witness from the said agency and get the fact proved. Except the photo copies of attendance sheet, the workman has not produced any evidence to

prove his claim. Even he has not proved these statements by producing the original or by getting the same proved with the help of original. Otherwise also these statements show the workman having marked his attendance during April to June, 1998 and in one more month, the name of which is not shown. The statements are shown to be signed by Head, C.P.T.R.I. Regional Centre, Gill Road, Ludhiana. The statements even if taken as true do not show that the workman was engaged by the Management directly and he had worked for them for more than 240 days.

As against to it there are copies, of letter dated 12th of Oct., 1998, of Form F, of agreement between Messrs Security Detective System (India) and Administrative Officer CFIRI, Mysore dated 8th of April, 1991, of another agreement dated 30th of Sept., 1998 between Messrs National Security and Allied Services Garha Road Jalandhar, of Letter dated 9th of April, 2002. All these documents read together show that the two agencies had contract with the Management for the supply of workforce during the period in question and that the services of the workman were terminated by Messrs National Security and Allied Services Jalandhar w.e.f. 12th Oct., 1998; and that the centre itself was closed 1st of December, 2002. The workman has not rebutted this evidence by any documents. On record I do not find evidence worthy of credit to hold that the workman was engaged by the Management directly and it was they who had terminated his services without paying him retrenchment compensation. Thus the workman is not entitled to any relief.

The reference is answered in these terms and the award is passed against the workman. Let a copy of the award be sent to the Appropriate Government for necessary action and the file be consigned to records after due completion.

KULDIP SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 458.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार कोचीन पोर्ट ट्रस्ट के प्रबंधक के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, अर्नाकुलम के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 19/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-2-2008 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-33011/8/2006-आई आर (बी-II)]

राजिन्द्र कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 12th February, 2008

S.O. 458.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central

Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 19/2007) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-Cum-Labour Court, Ernakulam as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Cochin Port Trust and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 12-02-2008.

[No. L-33011/8/2006-IR(B-II)]

RAJINDER KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, ERNAKULAM

Present :

Shri P. L. Norbert, B.A., LL.B., Presiding Officer

(Monday the 15th day of October 2007)

I.D. No. 19 of 2007

Union : The General Secretary,
Cochin Port Staff Association,
Willingdon Island, Kochi-682 009.

Management : The Chairman,
Cochin Port Trust,
Willingdon Island, Kochi-682 003.

By Adv. M/s. B. S. Krishnan Associates.

This case coming up for hearing on 15-10-2007, this Tribunal-cum-Labour Court on the same day passed the following.

AWARD

This is a reference made under Section 10(1)(d) and (2A) of I.D. Act 1947, The claim is for promotion and re-fixation of seniority.

Though notice was served, management alone entered appearance. Union was given sufficient opportunity to appear. But they have not chosen to be present. Therefore it has to be presumed that there is no subsisting dispute.

In the result, an award is passed finding that the action of the management of Cochin Port Trust in denying promotion to Shri. A. N. Gopi to the post of Head Mazdoor and fixing his seniority, is just and fair and he is not entitled for any relief.

Typed, corrected and passed by me on this the 15th day of October, 2007.

P. L. NORBERT, Presiding Officer

Appendix : Nil.

नई दिल्ली, 12 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 459.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सिंडिकेट बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, बेंगलूर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 14/2006) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-2-2008 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12011/162/2005 आई आर (बी-II)]

राजिन्द्र कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 12th February, 2008

S.O. 459.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 14/2006) of the Central Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Bangalore as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of Syndicate Bank and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 12-2-2008.

[No. L-12011/162/2005-IR (B-II)]

RAJINDER KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, BANGALORE

Dated : 14th January 2008

PRESENT

Shri A.R. Siddiqui, Presiding Officer

C.R. No. 14/2006

I PARTY

The Secretary,
Syndicate Bank
Employees Union,
No. 138, 2nd Floor,
2nd Main Road,
Seshadripuram,
Bangalore-560020

II PARTY

The General Manager (P),
Syndicate Bank,
General Manager's Office,
No. 69, 9th Main III Block,
Jayanagar,
Bangalore-560011

AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section 2A of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide order No. L-12011/162/2005-IR (B-II) dated 17th April 2006 for adjudication on the following schedule :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Syndicate Bank in passing the order of terminating the services by compulsory retirement from the

services of the bank against the workman Shri S.M. Harijan, Attender, Syndicate Bank, Horti Branch w.e.f. 30-8-2002 is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief he is entitled and from which date ?"

2. A charge sheet dated 1-12-2001 came to be served upon the first party in the following terms :

Charge Sheet

It is alleged against you as under :

"That you were functioning as Attender at our Bijjargi branch between 18-11-1981 and 9-6-2001 and while working in hour position as such :

- (1) You have misappropriated amounts aggregating to Rs. 4000 given by Shri Siddaraya Channamallappa Masali and Shri Srishaila P. Ingaleshwar for credit of their SB account 3773, Loan Account OSL/PSE 27/2000.
- (2) On 23-7-1999 you got sanctioned a loan of Rs. 15,000 in the name of your dependent daughter Smt. Shobha Sidaram Agarkhed.
- (3) You were having financial dealing with/have borrowed funds from Shri MS Kohali and Shri M.G. Gunaki, bank's clients."

3. The explanation offered by the first party not being found satisfactory, a Domestic Enquiry was ordered being participated by him taking the assistance of DR, Shri Abdul Jaleel, Secretary, Syndicate Bank Employees' Union, and it is on the conclusion of the enquiry, the enquiry findings were submitted holding the workman guilty of all the aforesaid 3 charges. The first party was served with the enquiry report and his submission once again not being found satisfactory, the disciplinary authority proposed the punishment of compulsory retirement from the services of the bank as against first charge and as against Charge Nos. 2 and 3 proposed the punishment of reduction in basic pay by one stage for 3 years and punishment of reduction of basic pay by one stage for one year respectively. The first party preferred an appeal against the aforesaid punishment order unsuccessfully. Thereupon, he raised the dispute before the authority concerned resulting into the present reference proceedings. The first party by way of his claim statement, in first instance challenged the enquiry proceedings on the ground that they were not conducted in accordance with the principles of natural justice and as per the terms of Bipartite Settlement. He challenged the enquiry findings as suffering from perversity on the grounds that the enquiry officer has not evaluated the evidence on record objectively and judiciously and that they are contrary to the evidence. He relied upon the testimony of the illiterate witnesses who used colloquial language in answering the questions being put to them

by the enquiry officer as well as the Presiding Officer, that the conclusions arrived at by the enquiry officer to hold that charge No. 1 is established are not tenable in law as the evidence on record does not establish the above said charge not being sufficient and legal and therefore, the findings of the enquiry officer on charge No. 1 are perverse. He also challenged the findings of the enquiry officer against charge Nos. 2 and 3 as not proved by sufficient and legal evidence. He then challenged the impugned punishment order on the ground that the Disciplinary Authority did not apply its independent mind to the evidence on record so also the submissions made by the first party during the course of personal hearing; that the Disciplinary Authority did not take into consideration the past service record of the first party and the fact that he was helping the customers in various ways and was considered to be a loyal bank employee; that the punishment of compulsory retirement was extremely excessive and disproportionate to the charges of misconduct. Therefore, the first party requested this tribunal to set aside the impugned punishment order by reinstating him in service with full back wages, continuity of service and other consequential benefits.

4. The management by its counter statement, while narrating the allegations as made out in the charge sheet, supported by the statement of imputations however, contended that the enquiry proceedings conducted against the first party were in accordance with the principles of natural justice affording the first party sufficient and reasonable opportunity to participate and defend himself taking the assistance of DR who in turn cross-examined the management witnesses and also produced the defence witnesses. The management therefore, contended that it is on the conclusion of the enquiry based on oral and documentary evidence enquiry report was submitted holding the workman guilty of the charges and it after affording the opportunity of personal hearing, the impugned punishment was awarded against the first party by the Disciplinary Authority to be confirmed by the Appellate Authority being challenged by the first party. The management also justified the impugned punishment order of compulsory retirement as against Charge No. 1 on the ground that the aforesaid charge proved against the first party involved moral turpitude of misappropriating the funds of the management bank in the guise of helping the customers of the bank. Therefore, the management requested this tribunal to reject the reference.

5. Keeping in view the respective contentions of the parties with regard to the validity and fairness or otherwise of the enquiry proceedings, this tribunal in the first instance framed the following Preliminary Issue :

“Whether the Domestic Enquiry conducted against the first party by the second party is fair and proper.”

6. During the course of trial of the said issue, the management examined the enquiry officer as MW1 and got marked 7 documents at Ex. M1 to M7 which include the proceedings of enquiry, enquiry report as well as the documents marked during the course of enquiry. The first party did not choose to examine himself and it is after hearing the learned counsels for the respective parties this tribunal by order dated 3-10-2007 answered the said issue in favour of the management holding that the DE conducted against the first party by the Second Party is fair and proper. Thereupon, I have heard the learned counsels for the respective parties on merits i.e. on the question of alleged perversity of the findings and the quantum of the punishment.

7. Learned counsel, Shri Ramesh Upadhyaya representing the second party while supporting the enquiry findings argued that the statement of the first party at the end of the enquiry, in meeting the charges of misconduct leveled against him would make it abundantly clear that he did not refute those charges but explained the circumstances, thereby, impliedly admitting those charges. He referred to the statement of the defence witness, one of the two complainants and invited the attention of this tribunal to his answer against question Nos. 19 and 20 so as to suggest that he admitted the fact of making a complaint against the first party for having paid Rs. 3000 to be credited to his account and that contents of his complaint are correct. Finally the learned counsel submitted that there was sufficient oral and documentary evidence much less legal evidence to substantiate the above said three charges against the first party and therefore, impugned punishment order was justified.

8. Learned counsel, Shri Muralidhar representing the first party on the other hand vehemently argued that the oral and documentary evidence produced during the course of enquiry, first of all, is neither sufficient nor legal and secondly was not worth credence as in the very observations made by the enquiry officer MW1 was not witness competent to speak to the charges of misconduct or to the contents of the documents marked. Whereas, from the statement of MW2, the next witness for the management, it gets very much clear that he did not pay a sum of Rs. 3000 into the hands of the first party. Coming to the documentary evidence, learned counsel submitted that the documents marked at Exs.M 7, 9 and 11 said to be the complaints made by one Mr. S.C. Masoli and Mr. Ingaleshwar speaking to the first charge leveled against the first party could not have been acted upon as in the very words of the enquiry officer, the first witness for the management said to be the Dy. Chief Manager, Vigilance Unit was not competent to speak to the contents of those complaints and as noted above, in the very statement made in his examination chief MW2 has come out with the version that he did not pay sum of Rs. 3000 into the hands of the first party.

Now, coming to the Second Charge. Learned counsel submitted that on the face of it itself, the allegations made against the first party on the said charge can never make out a case of any misconduct said to have been committed by him. He submitted that the loan in favour of the daughter of the first party was sanctioned by the competent bank officers, the first party not being in picture either as a party recommending the case of the customer or as a surety to the loan granted. Therefore, merely because loan was granted in favour of the daughter of the first party which in fact has been repaid in full, there being no default at any point of time, by no stretch of imagination it can be said that there was any misconduct committed by the first party, loan being sanctioned in favour of his daughter. As against the 3rd charge, learned counsel submitted that of course, the first party was borrowing certain loans from certain bank customers but those were the private transactions between the first party and those customers, not resulting in any financial loss to the bank and that all the cheques issued by the first party in favour of those customers never came to be dishonoured. In this connection he relied upon the statement of the defence witnesses by name Mr. M.G. Gunaki and Kohli to speak to the fact that whatever loan the first party obtained from them has been repaid by him and that their dealings with the first party were quite fair. Therefore, learned counsel submitted that none of the three charges against the first party have been proved by sufficient and legal evidence and that the evidence which was brought on record was not worth credence to be acted upon and therefore, findings of the enquiry officer based on the aforesaid evidence suffered from perversity.

9. After having gone through the reference, I find substance in the arguments advanced for the first party. First of all as argued for the first party, the important and the competent witness namely the Investigation Officer Mr. Kisur said to have conducted the investigation and recorded the statements/complaints at Ex. MEX-7, 9 and 11, said to have been made by the said Shri S.C. Mosali and Mr. Ingaleshwar and these two complainants have not been examined before the enquiry officer either to speak to the fact that he conducted the investigation or that these two complainants had given him the aforesaid statements/complaints. Not only the Investigation Officer was not examined but also the Investigation Report as such was not placed on record before the enquiry officer despite the demand made by the DR for the first party. Infact, the enquiry officer gave the ruling in favour of the management in not producing the side Investigation Report. Therefore, now in the absence of the Investigation Officer and the aforesaid two complainants, the question now to be considered would be "Whether the oral as well the documentary evidence produced during the course of the enquiry was sufficient legal and worth credence to establish the aforesaid charges

of misconduct leveled against the first party much less the charges of misconduct leveled against him with regard to the misappropriation of the funds of Rs. 4000 as alleged in the charge sheet i.e. on charge No. 1." MW1 said to be the Dy Chief Manager, Vigilance Unit, I.R. Cell, Bangalore is the witness through whom almost all the documents produced i.e. from MEX. 1 to 42 have been marked. In his own words MW1 is not the Investigation Officer and that the so called statement of the complainants and other witnesses have been recorded by the Investigation Officer, Mr. Kisur. Now, therefore, the question would be whether relying upon the statement of MW1, the enquiry officer could have come to the conclusion that the aforesaid Charge No. 1 was proved against the first party or not. It is interesting to note that the enquiry officer himself, while, recording his findings on second part of Charge No. 3 with regard to the misconduct of misappropriation of Rs. 3000 by the first party, discarded the evidence of MW1 observing that he was not witness competent to vouch for the contents of the documents produced. The observations made by the enquiry officer on this aspect of the case found on pages 26 and 27 of the enquiry report are as under :

"To substantiate the allegations, management side has examined MW1 who was the then Senior Manager, Vigilance Unit, Bangalore in the absence of the Investigating Officer. In my opinion MW1 can only identify the documents seized by the Investigation Officer but he cannot vouch for the contents as he is not the official who has collected the documents and he is not the official who has meet the complainants or other persons from whom the ID collected evidence. So I refer his evidence only for the limited purpose of narrating the incidence or reproducing the incidence in accordance with the documents which are self contained and self explanatory. To substantiate the charge 1(b), management side has not examined either the Investigating Officer or the branch manager to whom MEX-9 is addressed and who has witnessed MEX-11 or Shri Ingaleshwar the account holder who is the complainant. Among all these three persons, the complainant is the most important person whom defence side has examined as their witness (DW2). Management side has examined Shri Shankar with whom the complainant discussed the incidence reported in the charge sheet and about whom the complainant has referred in his complaint and deposition. Therefore, Shri Shankar is the first person who is supposed to know about the incidence before the complainant was addressed to the branch manager. Therefore, it will be proper to first analyse the evidence of MW2."

10. Therefore, from the reading of the very observations of the enquiry officer, it becomes crystal clear that MW1 was not the witness competent to vouch the contents of the documents but to identify those documents seized by the Investigation Officer. Now, therefore, when the evidence of MW1 goes away then we have got the evidence of MW2 to prove the second part of the charge of the misconduct of misappropriation of Rs. 3000. It is once again interesting to note that the statement of MW2 in his examination chief itself, was sufficient for the enquiry officer to come to the conclusion that his evidence was not legal and sufficient to prove the said charge against the first party. While, discussing the evidence of MW2 brought on pages 10 and 11 of the enquiry report, the enquiry officer noted as follows :

“He had been to Bijjargi branch for recovery work. In Bijjargi bus stand, Shri Srishail Ingaleshwar met him and informed that he has paid Rs. 28,000 towards his loan account, but only Rs. 25,000 was credited. There was difference of Rs. 3,000. He showed some receipts. In one of the receipts dated 3-10-2000 for Rs. 3000, cash seal was affixed without signature of cashier or supervisor. He informed that the receipt was prepared by Shri Sidram Harijan. When MW2 asked him as to whether he paid cash to Shri Harijan, he informed that he had not given cash to Harijan MW2 informed him to go to Bijjargi branch and enquiry the matter. From the above, MW2 understood that Rs. 3000 was not credited to loan account of Shri Ingaleshwar. He did not enquire with Shri Ingaleshwar how the receipt was issued without handing over cash to Shri Harijan. Receipt cannot be issued by the bank unless amount is remitted”.

11. Therefore, as could be read from the above said statement of MW2, the first party said to have shown some receipts to MW2 and one of them was the receipt dated 3-10-2000 for Rs. 3000 bearing the cash seal of the bank but without the signature of the cashier or the supervisor. As noted above, in the very words of MW2 when he asked the said Ingaleshwar as to whether he paid the amount into the hands of the first party, he informed that he did not give cash to Shri Harijan (the first party). It is to be noted that very strangely, MW2 did not ask Mr. Ingaleshwar as to why the receipt was issued without handing over the cash to Shri Harijan. Therefore, admittedly when Shri Ingaleshwar did not pay the amount into the hands of the first party, the question of the first party to issue him any receipt shall never arise. It was unnatural on the part of MW2 not to ask Mr. Ingaleshwar as to why the receipt was issued when the amount was paid. That apart, the very receipt which is said to have been shown to MW2 by Shri Ingaleshwar has not been forthcoming. In the natural course, MW2 must have obtained or secured the said receipt from Mr.

Ingaleshwar in order to ascertain as to whether the first party really issued the said receipt and whether he really credited Rs. 3000 into his account after having passed the said receipt. Neither MW2 obtained the receipt from Mr. Ingaleshwar nor it has been secured during the course of investigation by the Investigation Officer and that appears to be the reason it is brought on record. Therefore, in the light of the aforesaid statement of MW2 stating that Mr. Ingaleshwar did not pay the amount to the first party and in the light of the fact that Ingaleshwar himself has not come forward, as argued for the first party, it is very strange as to how the enquiry officer as a man of prudence could act upon the above said statement of MW2 in coming to the conclusion that Ingaleshwar did pay Rs. 3000 into the hands of the first party and that the first party did not credit the same into his account after having collected the same from Shri Ingaleshwar. It is in this view of the matter there appears substantial force in the arguments advanced for the first party that the findings recorded by the enquiry officer relying upon the testimony of MW2 to the effect that the second part of the charge No. 1 has been proved against the first party is perverse and unreasonable. Not only there was no legal and sufficient evidence but also the very evidence in the statement of MW2 was to disprove the charge of misconduct leveled against the first party rather than to prove the same. Similarly, with regard to the first part of the charge No. 1, one Mr. S.C. Masali, is said to have paid Rs. 6800 to first party on 29-12-2000 and that first party did not remit the entire amount of Rs. 6800 on that date but credited a sum of Rs. 5800 on 29-12-2000 vide Ex.MEX.5, fails to be substantiated by way of cogent and convincing evidence. Here, again the most competent witness to speak to the said fact rather to say that a sum of Rs. 6800 infact was paid to the first party, Mr. S.C. Masali himself was the competent witness to speak about the said fact. In this context again the enquiry officer relies upon his so called statement at Ex.MEX-7 said to have been made before the Investigation Officer. When Mr. Masali was not examined and contents of Ex. MEX-7 were not proved in his statement not the investigation officer was examined to speak to the fact that such a statement was given to him, it is not understandable as to how the enquiry officer could have blindly acted upon the above said statement at Ex.MEX-7 to jump to the conclusion that the first party infact received a sum of Rs. 6800 on 29-12-2000 but remitted Rs. 5800 on the same date and then remitted Rs. 1000 on the following day. The moot question to be established before the enquiry officer was the fact that a sum of Rs. 6800 infact was paid to the first party by Mr. Masali and that fact as noted above, has not been proved either by examining the said complainant, Shri Masali or by examining the Investigation Officer. Contents of Ex. MEX-7 therefore, have not been proved as in the very words of the enquiry officer they could not have been

proved in the statement of MW1 as he was not competent to vouch the contents of the documents. When evidence of MW1 is taken away and it is further to be taken that contents of MEX-7 are not proved then by no stretch of imagination it can be said that the fact of payment of Rs. 6800 by Mr. Masalai to the first party has been substantiated. Therefore, the findings arrived at by the enquiry officer to the contrary again must be held to be perverse and unreasonable. The only trump card for the management in this context was that undisputedly the first party paid a sum of Rs. 1000 into the account of Mr. Masali on 30-12-2000 so as to make good of the short payment he made on 29-12-2000. Here the explanation offered by the first party is that he was threatened by the officials of the bank for dire consequences, if he did not remit Rs. 1000 and in order to avoid such of the dire consequences he deposited a sum of Rs. 1000 on the said date. This explanation of the first party could not have been rejected having regard to the fact that the first party as an attender held a vulnerable position as the officials of the bank gave much importance and credence to the alleged statement of Mr. Masali that he in fact, had paid Rs. 6800 to the first party rather believing his explanation that he did not receive the amount of Rs. 6800 as stated by Mr. Masali. Therefore, merely, because of the first party paid a sum of Rs. 1000 on 30-12-2000 into the account of the said Masali, no conclusion can be drawn to the effect that he in fact had received a sum of Rs. 6800 from Mr. Masali, for such a conclusion to be drawn, Mr. Masali was the witness competent to be produced before the enquiry officer giving a opportunity to the first party to cross examine him on the said point. Therefore, in the light of the above, this court has no hesitation in its mind to come to the conclusion that the findings of the enquiry officer that the above said charge No. 1 has been proved against the first party suffered from perversity not being based upon sufficient and legal evidence much less the evidence worth credence.

12. Now, coming to the Second Charge. From the very wordings of the second charge as noted above, one cannot but to conclude that there is no misconduct committed by the first party. Merely, because a loan of Rs. 15000 was sanctioned in the name of the daughter of the first party, one can not jump to the conclusion that the first party fraudulently or stealthily got sanctioned the said loan amount in favour of his daughter. As argued for the first party, the daughter of the first party was an independent and legal entity undisputedly, married when the said loan transaction took place. It is ridiculous to say that the first party as an attender was in a position to get the loan sanctioned in favour of his daughter that too suppressing the fact that the loanee was his daughter. It is of common knowledge that the banking authority will be sanctioning the loan after having followed a lengthy procedure, if not, a cumbersome procedure and it is the

officers of the bank after being satisfied, the eligibility of the loan claimed will be sanctioning the same. It just cannot be taken to be granted that the first party being attender could have prevailed upon the officers of the bank to get the loan sanctioned or that it was possible for him to have suppressed the fact that the loanee was his daughter. As noted above, she was a married woman, an independent legal entity and in that capacity she applied for the loan and the authority concerned being satisfied with the claim must have sanctioned the loan. It is again interesting to note that for the repayment of the loan there was absolutely no default committed by the party. Instalment amount was being paid regularly and the loan ultimately was closed after its full payment. It is also to be noted that the first party was neither the surety nor the co-applicant for the loan in question to be held responsible much less to say that he got the loan sanctioned in favour of his daughter by any dubious means. Therefore, finding recorded by the learned enquiry officer to the contrary is liable to be quashed as suffering from perversity.

13. Now coming to the 3rd charge, that the first party was having financial dealings having borrowed funds from one Mr. M.S. Kohali and Mr. M.G. Gunaki, the bank's customers. The fact that he had borrowed certain funds from those two persons of course have not been disputed by the first party. Infact, the first party by way of defence has examined the said two persons as his witnesses and both of them have deposed to the fact that the first party was borrowing certain sums from them and was paying back those loan amounts to them and for that they had no problem at any point of time. Therefore, as argued for the first party even if, he was borrowing certain amounts by way of loan from the aforesaid two persons or from others, on that count alone he cannot be held responsible for any misconduct as first of all such a transaction does not come under the definition of the misconduct. Certainly, as argued for the first party it was the private affair in between the first party and the money lenders. Only because, he borrowed money from the persons who happened to be customers of the bank, by no stretch of imagination it can be said that the first party as an attender took undue advantage of his position as a bank official and borrowed funds from those persons. From the reading of the imputation statement with regard to the charge itself it is established that the first party after having borrowed certain amount from the above said two persons had repaid the same by issuing cheques in their favour and, it is not the case of management that those cheques have been dishonoured. As per the statement, the first party said to have issued a cheque of Rs. 10,300 on 1-5-2000 though his SB Account was showing the balance of Rs. 92.47. Here again it is not the case of the management that the said cheque in fact was tendered and was dishonoured. Moreover, it is not

made clear in the aforesaid charge sheet that such of those transactions of the first party constituted any misconduct. In the result and for the reasons foregoing I am of the opinion that none of the above said three charges stand proved against the first party and therefore, findings of the enquiry officer holding the workman guilty of the aforesaid charges are liable to be quashed as illegal, arbitrary and perverse.

14. In the light of aforesaid findings of this tribunal, it goes without saying that the impugned punishment order passed against the first party based on the aforesaid findings is again liable to be set aside as illegal and unjust. In the result, the resultant corollary would be his reinstatement in service with full back wages, continuity of service and other consequential benefits. Hence the following award :

AWARD

The management is directed to reinstate the first party into its services with full back wages from the date of impugned punishment order till the date of his reinstatement with continuity of service and all other consequential benefits. No costs.

(Dictated to PA transcribed by her corrected and signed by me on 14th January 2008)

A.R. SIDDIQUI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 460.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार इन्स्टिट्यूट ऑफ प्लास्टिक इंजीनियर एण्ड टेक्नोलॉजी के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण बंगलोर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 26/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-2-2008 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/216/2002 आई आर (सी-II)]
अजय कुमार गौड़, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 12th February, 2008

S.O. 460.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award Ref. No. 26/2003 of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Bangalore as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of Central Institute of Plastic Engg. & Tech. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 12-2-2008.

[No. L-42012/216/2002-IR (C-II)]
AJAY KUMAR GAUR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, BANGALORE

Dated : 18th January 2008

PRESENT

Shri A.R. Siddiqui, Presiding Officer

C.R. No. 26/2003

I PARTY

Shri K.R. Ravi,
S/o Shri K.G. Raju,
Extension,
Siddappaji Nilaya,
Teacher Colony,
Kanakapura,
Kanakapura Taluk,
Bangalore Rural Distt.
Bangalore.

II PARTY

The Deputy Director,
Central Institute of Plastic J.C.
Engg. & Tech.
437/A, Hebbal Industrial Area,
Mysore-570016

AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section 2A of the Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide order No. L-42012/216/2002-IR (C-II) dated 24th April 2003 for adjudication on the following schedule :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of CIPET is justified by denying employment to Shri K.R. Ravi, Ex. Machine Operator with effect from 1-6-2001 ? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date ?"

2. The case of the first party workman as made out, in the Claim Statement, in brief, and relevant for the purpose is to the effect that the management after having conducted an interview and complying with the formalities on 6-5-1996 appointed the first party as Machine Operator (Tool Room) w.e.f. 6-5-1996. He worked with the management from the date of his above said appointment till 1-6-2001 honestly and diligently. He was refused work from 1-6-2001 without giving any reasons. His representation dated 6-6-2001 seeking employment did not get any response from the management. He issued a legal notice dated 4-8-2001 but the management replied the same taking all untenable contentions. Therefore, he raised the dispute before the conciliation officer concerned and since the conciliation proceedings ended in failure report, the dispute has been referred to this tribunal by way of reference. Therefore, the first party contended that the action of the management in refusing employment to him w.e.f. 1-6-2001 being

otherwise for misconduct tantamounts to retrenchment as defined under section 2(oo) of the ID Act and since there has been no compliance of Section 25F of the said Act, the retrenchment becomes illegal termination of his services. He requested this tribunal to pass an award setting aside the termination order with a direction to the management to reinstate him in service with continuity of service, back wages and all other consequential benefits.

3. The management by its counter statement in the first instance took up the contention that it is a registered society under the Society's Registration Act, established in the year 1968 and it is an Autonomous Institute under the Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilisers, Govt. of India and is a Govt. of India Educational Institution offering long term training programmes in the area of plastic engineering. Therefore, the management is not an 'Industry' and the provisions of the ID Act are not applicable to it and hence the dispute is not maintainable. While, coming to the merits of the case, the management contended that the first party was never engaged at any point of time by the management but was taken as a temporary Machine Operator on consolidated payment of Rs. 1000 per month on a specific project assignment which project came to be completed in the month of May 2001 and the first party was given a break from 1-6-2001. Not disputing the fact that the first party was called for interview on 7-3-1986 (it ought to have been 1996) and that interview was conducted for the sole purpose of testing whether a candidate has full knowledge and capacity to handle conventional and CNC machine and the first party being ITI holder was considered for the said project. Therefore, he was neither appointed nor terminated by the management and in the result question of his illegal termination never arose. At para 6 of the counter statement the management contended that the first party's last assignment was for M/s. Ashok Layland and when the said project was completed during the month of May 2001, he was given a break from 1-6-2001 and was not engaged thereafter; that the first party being a casual employee cannot claim permanency/regularisation as a matter of right; that when he came to the premises of the management on 1-6-2001 he was informed that since the project he was engaged for was completed his services were not required any more and therefore, there was no question of any refusal of employment. The management at Para 8 of the Counter Statement further contended that the first party was engaged on casual basis and was not a permanent employee, he did not work for more than 240 days in a year and hence question of the management retrenching the first party does not arise. Therefore, the management requested this tribunal to reject the reference.

4. On 6-10-2004, having regard to the contention taken by the management that it does not come under

the definition of the Industry, a Preliminary issue was framed as under :

"Whether the Management's Educational Institute is not an Industry as contended by it in Para 1 of the Counter Statement"?

5. Thereupon, the case came to be posted for evidence to be let on behalf of the parties on the above said Preliminary Issue as well as on the reference point. The management in order to substantiate its contentions by way of Counter Statement filed an affidavit of one Mr. M. V. Raman Rao working Manager (Accounts) in the management institute reiterating almost all the contentions taken by the management in its counter statement. In his examination chief three documents, namely, the Xerox copies of change of name of the management society, registration certificate of the management and a format with regard to admission notice were marked at Exts. M1 to M3 respectively subject to the production of original or certified copies of the documents. In his cross-examination it was elicited that the first party was working as a Machine Operator and the operator job is still in existence and there is an operator already appointed. It was elicited that the first party was designated as Casual Machine Operator and he was in the service of the management from 1996 to 2001 all along with certain breaks in service and that he cannot say what were those breaks and on what dates. But he can produce the records in that respect. In his further cross-examination when he was recalled once again he was asked as to whether he has brought any record to produce in the court and whether now he can say about the period of the breaks given to the first party between 1996 and 2001. He was again unable to give the period of breaks. He denied the suggestion that there were no breaks in the service of the first party during the said period and that his statement is not based on the records. In his further cross-examination on the point of the preliminary issue, it was elicited that the finished material such as plastic moulds which were being got manufactured during the course of training given to the students, will be used for purpose of demonstration and some of them will be sold. They will be collecting some charges by way of machine hour rate while selling those materials to the person who had supplied the raw materials without collecting the labour charges. When he was confronted with one of such bills being issued to the customer at Ex. W1 he admitted that it is one of the bills issued by the management in that respect.

6. The first party also filed his affidavit evidence repeating the very same averments as made in the claim statement and in his further examination chief got marked 7 documents at Exts. W1 to W7 (they ought to have been marked at Exts. W2 to W8 as Ex. W1 was already marked in the cross-examination of MW1). In his cross-

examination it was elicited that there was no appointment order as such issued to him. He however, admitted that his services were engaged as a temporary Machine Operator on the consolidated wages of Rs. 1000 but denied the suggestion that he was given work on temporary basis and not on permanent basis. He also denied the suggestion that he did not work for a period of 240 days in any calendar year and that the work for which his services were engaged by the management came to an end as on 1-6-2001.

7. Now, therefore, in the light of the aforesaid Preliminary Issue and the points of reference schedule the first important question to be decided would be as to whether the management is not an Industry as defined under the provisions of the ID Act. Both the learned counsels for the parties have filed their written arguments on the line of their respective pleadings by way of claim as well as Counter claim.

8. After having gone through the evidence brought on record in the oral testimony of MW1 as well as the aforesaid documents at Ex. W1, I am of the considered view that the management comes under the definition of an Industry as defined under the provisions of the ID Act. As noted above, on this point the statement of MW1 was to the effect that the finished materials such as plastic moulds which are being manufactured during the course of the training given to the students will be used for the purpose of demonstration and some of them will be sold. He further admitted that they will be collecting some charges by way of machine hour rate while selling those materials to the person who had supplied the raw material. When he was confronted with Ex. W1 he was to admit that it is one of those bills being issued to the customer supplying the materials and then getting the moulds. The perusal of Ex. W1 will disclose that as on 14-9-1999 when it was issued in favour of the customer by name the Dynamic Tool Craft, a bill amount of Rs. 900 was raised for the purpose of labour charges for boring CNC Milling. Therefore, from the above statement of MW1, it becomes crystal clear that the management was engaged in manufacturing activities and some of the materials namely, Plastic Moulds which were being manufactured by the management during the course of training given to the students were also being sold to the customers who supplied the raw material. In the result, having regard to the above said facts and the principle laid down by their Lordship of Supreme Court in the famous case of *Rajappa Vs. BWSSB*, it can be safely held that the management comes under the definition of the 'Industry' and in the result, the present dispute raised under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act is very much maintainable.

9. Now, the next question to be considered would be whether the first party worked with management continuously for a period of 240 days or more in any

calendar year much less in a calendar year before his services were brought to an end. In this connection the very admissions made by the management by way of counter statement as well as in the affidavit evidence of MW1 and by way of cross-examination, will answer the above said question. As noted above, at Para 3 of the counter statement the management came out with the case that the first party was interviewed on 7-3-2006 and he being an ITI degree holder found fit to be appointed for the purpose of some project. As noted above, in his cross-examination the management admitted that the first party was designated as casual machine operator and was in the service of the management from 1996 to 2001 but with a rider that it was with certain breaks. He was unable to give details of those breaks and the period during which those breaks were done. Infact, MW1 was once again cross-examined after a gap of about 4 months and on that day also he was unable to say the period of the breaks given to the first party. On the last occasion when he was cross-examined, he wanted to produce the records to show the breaks in service but he did not bring or produce those records when he was recalled for further cross-examination after the said gap. Therefore, the management has not been in a position to establish before this tribunal that the services of the first party between 1996 and 2001 suffered from certain breaks. Infact, when we closely scrutinize the contention taken by the management in its counter statement as well as in the statement of MW1 it becomes evident that the first party was being engaged by the management all along between 1996 and 2001. The management has come out with the case that he was engaged for a particular project and since that project was completed as on 1-6-2001 the first party was asked not to report for duty in future. This stand of the management itself, is sufficient to say that there was absolutely no break in service of the first party in between 1996 and 2001. The contention of the management that the first party was engaged for the purpose of work in the project and since it was completed his services were no more required gets no support from any oral or documentary evidence except the self serving testimony of MW1. Infact, as noted above, MW1 in his cross-examination was to admit that the first party was working as a machine operator and that operator job is still in existence. That means to say that the first party was not engaged for a particular project but as a machine operator which job is still available with the management. In the result, when the first party has been shown working with the management for about a period of 5 years all along continuously between 1996 and 2001, then it goes without saying that he worked with the management for a period of 240 days and more in each of the calendar year much less in a calendar year immediately preceding his alleged termination by way of refusal of work by the management. Undisputedly, the termination was not on account of the misconduct committed by him and therefore, it attracts

577 42/68-23

the provisions of Section 2(oo) of the ID Act. There being no compliance of Section 25F of the ID Act, the termination amounts to illegal retrenchment liable to be quashed at the hands of this tribunal as illegal and void ab initio.

10. In the normal course when the termination held to be illegal, the proper relief to be granted will be by way of reinstatement in service. However, in the present case the services of the first party were being engaged by the management on a casual basis and it is not the case of the first party that he was taken in service on permanent basis, his name being sponsored through employment exchange and the rules and regulations being followed by the management for the appointment of such a candidate. Undisputedly, there was no appointment order as such issued in favour of the first party and it is in the words of the first party himself, he was taken in service on consolidated payment of Rs. 1000 per month. Therefore, the relief of reinstatement is not desirable in the case of such a temporary employee.

11. Now, the next question to be considered would be what should be the back wages to be paid along with other service benefits to the first party. Having regard to the fact that his services were being engaged by the management for a consolidated sum of Rs. 1000 per month and the period of about 6 years elapsed from the date of his termination till the date of this award, it appears to me that ends of justice will be met if the first party is paid a lump sum amounts of Rs. 1,50,000 by way of compensation towards his full and final claim against the management. Hence the following Award :

AWARD

The management is directed to pay a sum of Rs. 1,50,000 to the first party in lump sum by way of compensation towards his full and final claim against the management. The amount shall be paid within a period of six months from the date of publication of the award or shall carry interest at the rate of 10 per cent per annum till its realization. No costs.

(Dictated to PA transcribed by her corrected and signed by me on 18th January 2008)

A.R. SIDDIQUI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 461.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मालप्रभा ग्रामीण बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, बेंगलूर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 31/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-2-2008 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/38/2003-आई आर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 12th February, 2008

S.O. 461.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 31/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Bangalore as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of Malaprabha Grameen Bank, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 12-2-2008.

[No. L-12012/38/2003-IR (B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, BANGALORE

Dated : 23rd January 2008

PRESENT

Shri A.R. Siddiqui, Presiding Officer

C.R. No. 31/2003

I PARTY

Shri Shantinatha Annasa Patil,
At & PO : Kaganoli,
Taluk : Chikkodi,
Belgaum District,
Karnataka State

II PARTY

The Chairman,
Malaprabha Grameen Bank,
Mruthunjanagar Branch,
Belgaum Road,
Dharwad,
Karnataka State

AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section 2A of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide order No. L-12012/38/2003-IR (B-1) dated 31st March 2003 for adjudication on the following schedule :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Malaprabha Grameena Bank in imposing the punishment of removal from services on Shri Shanthinath Annasa Patil is justified? If not, what relief he is entitled to?"

2. A charge sheet dated 14-9-2001 was served upon the first party workman in the following terms :—

Charge Sheet

That you were working as Messenger-cum-Sweeper of our Koganalli branch from 3-7-1995 till your suspension.

That while you were working in your position as such, you have with an ulterior motive to obtain

pecuniary benefit for yourselves, misutilising your position as Messenger-cum-Sweeper in the branch, utilized an amount of Rs. 30,000 out of loan of Rs. 60,000 sanctioned to Smt. Akkatai Jinagouda Patil of Koganalli Village.

By your above act, you have failed to discharge your duties with utmost honesty, integrity, devotion and diligence and acted in a manner detrimental to the interest of the bank and its customers, besides lowering the image of the bank and thus contravened Regulations 17, 19 read with 30(1) of Malaprabha Grameena Bank (Staff) Service Regulations, 1980."

3. His reply to the charge sheet denying the allegations made therein not being found satisfactory, a Domestic Enquiry was ordered against him appointing one Mr. R. V. Hulbazar, the then Sr. Manager of the bank as an enquiry officer. He conducted the enquiry in two sittings held on 16-10-2001 and 18-10-2001 and on the conclusion of the enquiry submitted his findings holding the workman guilty of the charges. The disciplinary authority based on the aforesaid findings therefore, passed the impugned punishment order removing him from service.

4. The case of the first party, as made out in the Claim Statement, in brief, and relevant for the purpose is that the enquiry was not conducted in fair and proper manner giving him full opportunity to defend himself. On merits he contended that the management failed to examine the material witness Smt. Akkatai patil, the borrower of the loan and therefore, there was no complaint by the borrower to the management about the charges leveled against him; that the whole disciplinary proceedings have been initiated only on the basis of the false certificate issued by the officials of the bank and that the borrower has already repaid the loan amount of Rs. 60,000 taken by her along with the interest amount; that the Disciplinary Authority based on the perverse findings of the enquiry officer passed the impugned punishment order without applying his mind and therefore, the findings as well as the impugned punishment order are liable to be set aside. He also contended that the punishment of removal from service is not proportionate to the charge of misconduct alleged against him. Therefore, he requested this tribunal to pass an award setting aside the impugned punishment order with relief of reinstatement, back wages and other consequential benefits.

5. The management by its Counter Statement, while justifying the proceedings of the enquiry conducted against the first party as fair and proper giving him reasonable opportunity to defend himself, further contended that the management produced two witnesses namely, Shri V. V. Ullagaddi, the then manager and

Shri C. P. Kulkarni, the then officer of Koganoli branch along with documentary evidence and whereas, the first party though was given opportunity to produce Smt. Akkatai Patil as his witness, failed to produce her before the enquiry officer despite two days time given to him by the enquiry officer. Therefore, the management contended that on the basis of the oral and documentary evidence produced during the course of enquiry, the enquiry officer was justified in coming to the conclusion that charges of misconduct leveled against the first party have been proved. The management contended that the burden was cast upon the first party workman to produce the said material witness Smt. Akkatai if he wanted to prove his defence that she did not make any complaint with the bank with regard to the fact that he misutilised a sum of Rs. 30,000 out of Rs. 60,000 loan amount sanctioned to her. The management further contended that on the basis of the enquiry findings the disciplinary authority was legally justified in proposing the punishment of removing him from service and then confirmed the same after having given opportunity of hearing to the first party. The management also contended that the punishment of removal from service was proportionate to the gravity of the misconduct committed by the first party as his services could not have been continued with the bank, he having lost the confidence of the management authority. The management therefore, requested this tribunal to reject the reference.

6. Keeping in view the respective contentions of the parties with regard to validity and fairness or otherwise of the enquiry proceedings, this tribunal on 9-9-2004 framed the following Preliminary issue :

"Whether the Domestic Enquiry conducted against the first party by the second party is fair and proper ?"

7. During the course of trial of the said issue, the management examined the enquiry officer and got marked 11 documents at Exs. M1 to M11. There being no evidence to be led on the part of the first party, learned counsels were heard in the matter and this tribunal by order dated 23-6-2005 answered the above said issue in favour of the management holding that the Domestic Enquiry conducted against the first party by the management is fair and proper and the matter came to be posted to hear the parties on merits of the case. In the meanwhile, interim applications were filed on behalf of the first party and they came to be rejected. Ultimately on 9-1-2008, learned counsels for the respective parties while advancing their oral arguments also submitted their written arguments. The sum and substance of the arguments for the first party was to the effect that the bank officials took the signature of Smt. Akkatai Patil on a bank paper and converted the same into a complaint saying that a sum of Rs. 30,000 out of Rs. 60,000 amount

in fact, was utilized/misutilised by the first party and it is based on the said report the first party was served with the charge sheet on hand. He contended that contents of the said complaint marked during the course of enquiry at Ex. MEX.5 (not before this tribunal) have not been proved by producing the said complaint before the enquiry officer. He contended that in fact, Smt. Akkatai Patil submitted her letter dated 11-9-2001 to the head office of the bank making it abundantly clear that she did not give a complaint dated 21-8-2001 and that her signature was obtained on blank paper and has been falsely converted into a complaint. Therefore, the learned counsel submitted that the complaint at Ex. MEX 5 has not been proved examining the complainant and in fact they were disproved by her subsequent letter dated 11-9-2001, the management was left with no other evidence sufficient and legal to prove the charges of misconduct leveled against the first party except the credit slip under which the first party said to have deposited an amount of Rs. 71,000 and odd against the SB account of Smt. Akkatai. Learned counsel further submitted that the enquiry officer has not dealt with oral and documentary evidence brought on record during the course of enquiry and submitted his findings without giving the reasonings as to how and in what manner, the first party utilized or misutilised the sum of Rs. 30,000 out of Rs. 60,000 loan amount sanctioned in favour of Smt. Akkatai. He submitted that the oral testimony of two management witnesses was just an hearsay evidence and not being supported by the statement of Smt. Akkatai during the course of enquiry cannot be attached any credence or significance. He submitted that findings of the enquiry officer therefore, were not based on sufficient and legal evidence and therefore, the resultant impugned punishment order passed against the first party is liable to be set aside. He also contended that the very charge of misconduct leveled against the first party is very vague and ambiguous and if read along with the impugned punishment order it can be revealed that there are lot of discrepancies with respect to the very figure of the amount said to have been misutilised by the first party.

8. Whereas, learned counsel for the management while supporting the enquiry findings argued that the first party by way of his letter at Ex. MEX 6 acknowledged the fact of obtaining the loan amount of Rs. 60,000 and undertook to pay the same before 31-8-2001 and that in pursuance of the said letter he credited a sum of Rs. 71,000 and odd vide credit slip at Ex. MEX. 6 and therefore, now he cannot turn around and to say that he did not commit the misconduct alleged against him. Learned counsel also submitted that first party was given fair and reasonable opportunity to produce Smt. Akkatai Patil as his defence evidence but failed to do so and therefore, the enquiry officer was justified in drawing

adverse inference against him. He submitted that since the misconduct alleged was misappropriation of the funds belonging to the bank's customer involving moral turpitude and since the bank lost confidence in him, the only proper punishment was removing him from service and therefore, it cannot be said that it was disproportionate to the gravity of the misconduct committed by him.

9. Keeping in view the findings recorded by this tribunal in favour of the management holding that the DE conducted against the first party by the management is fair and proper, now the only two important questions to be gone into would be :

- (i) "Whether the enquiry findings suffered from perversity.
- (ii) And if so, the punishment of removal from service of the first party was proportionate to the gravity of the misconduct committed by him."

10. Coming to the first question. On going through the records more particularly, the very findings of the enquiry officer, I find substance in the arguments advanced for the first party that the findings are not based on sufficient and legal evidence and that the reasonings given by the enquiry officer in coming to the conclusion that the first party committed the misconduct are not cogent and valid. In order to appreciate the respective arguments with regard to the findings, it appears to me worthwhile to bring on record the very findings/reasonings given by the enquiry officer in arriving at a conclusion of holding the first party guilty of the charges. The relevant reasonings and the observations of the enquiry officer with reference to the oral and documentary evidence brought out on pages 1 and 2 of the enquiry findings run as under :

"To prove this charge the Management Representative has produced 7 documents marked as management Exhibit-1 to 7 and two witnesses of the seven, two are of importance, viz.(1) Management Exhibit-3 being the credit slip on 4-9-2001 crediting Rs. 71,070 to the SB account No. 1950 signed by Shri S. A. Patil. Letter given by Smt. A. J. Patil, Management Exhibit-5 to the effect that Shri S.A. Patil has used Rs. 30,000 and that amount with interest on that amount has to be repaid by Shri S. A. Patil. In addition to there, two documents which directly go to show that the amount was paid to Shri S. A. Patil and it was paid by him the two witnesses have also deposed that the person to whom the loan was sanctioned has herself disclosed to the bank employees the fact of his using the amount for his personal gain. Further they have also deposed before me that the amount of Rs. 71,070 is paid by Shri S. A. Patil himself.

Against this, the charge sheeted employee has produced a letter from Smt. A. J. Patil that the letter dated 21-8-2001 was obtained from her and that she was not aware of the contents as her signature was obtained on blank paper. Even though an opportunity was given to charge sheeted employee to produce her as witness he failed. This shows that the letter is an after-thought. Agreeing that the contents of management Exhibit 5 were not known, i.e. it was a letter got written by the Manager what made Shri S. A. Patil to pay Rs. 71,070. Had he not used the fund, what made him to repay that amount. This shows that he had used the funds and because of that he has repaid it. As such I hold the employee guilty of the charge leveled against him."

11. Therefore, as could be seen from the aforesaid reasonings, the enquiry officer in the first instance out of the seven documents marked during the course of enquiry as management's exhibits at Ex.MEX 1 to 7 mainly relied upon the two documents namely, the credit slip dated 4-9-2001 at Ex. M3 whereunder the first party under his signature said to have credit a sum of Rs. 71,000 and odd to the SB account No. 1950 of Smt. Akkatai Patil. The next document is said to be the letter given by Smt. Akkatai speaking to the fact that the first party used Rs. 30000 and that he is liable to repay the balance amount. It was well argued for the first party that the letter at Ex. ME-5 said to have been given by Smt. Akkatai, being treated as complaint resulting into the charge sheet issued to the first party should not have been considered as legal evidence as undisputedly Smt. Akkatai was not examined before the enquiry officer as management witness. She was the witness important and competent to speak to the contents of the said letter/complaint made against the first party. It has come in the statement of MW2 during the course of enquiry that Smt. Akkatai Patil is aged and cannot write and that she got ME-5 written, got read and delivered. It is the case of the first party that MW1 and 2 infact, obtained the signature of Smt. Akkatai Patil on a blank paper and then converted it into a complaint, contents of which infact, were never told or dictated by the lady. It is further the defence of the first party that Smt. Akkatai Patil after having come to know that the first party is being implicated in a false case based on her alleged statement/complaint, wrote a letter dated 11-9-2001 to the head office disowning the above said complaint at Ex.ME-5 and warned the authorities of criminal action in case the bank proceeded against the first party on the basis of the aforesaid alleged complaint. Therefore, in the light of the above said defence and the fact that undisputedly, the first party produced the letter dated 11-9-2001 before the enquiry officer (which is noted in the enquiry findings), heavy burden cast upon the management to bring forth and produce Smt. Akkatai herself as its witness before the enquiry officer to testify to the recitals of her alleged

complaint at Ex. ME 5 so as to meet her subsequent letter dated 11-9-2001 disowning Ex. M 5. The enquiry officer very strangely as could be read from the findings referred to supra appears to have cast burden upon the first party to have produced Smt. Akkatai as his defence witness so as to dislodge Ex. ME 5. Therefore, reasonings given by the enquiry officer in casting the burden upon the shoulders of the first party for producing Smt. Akkatai as his witness certainly are perverse against the well settled and natural principle of justice and the principle of evidence. The management proceeded against the first party only on the basis of the aforesaid complaint at Ex.ME5 and it was for the management itself, to have proved the contents of the said document by producing the so called author of the said document namely, Smt. Akkatai Patil. It can be read from the findings and proceedings of the enquiry that absolutely no attempt was made on the part of the management to secure the presence of Smt. Akkatai and since the first party wanted to produce the said witness and failed to produce not being given sufficient time to produce her, the enquiry officer wants to say he was given opportunity to produce the said witness but failed to produce her. Therefore, these reasonings of the enquiry officer certainly suffered from perversity and therefore, the reliance made by him on the aforesaid document at Ex. ME 5 along with other evidence on record to connect the first party with guilt cannot be said to be a reliance placed on legal evidence. That apart, it is very strange to note that the aforesaid document at Ex. ME 5, reference of which is made in the enquiry findings and was relied upon by the enquiry officer is not forthcoming before this tribunal. The management produced as many as 11 documents and they have been marked at Ex. M-1 to M-11 but failed to produce the said important document so also the documents at Ex. ME1, 3, 4 and 7. Therefore, before this tribunal the management not only held back the very complaint, on the basis of which charge sheet was issued against the first party but also the aforesaid letter dated 11-9-2001 said to have been produced before the enquiry officer, as noted in his enquiry findings referred to supra. Therefore, in the absence of these two documents before this tribunal, the reasonings given by the enquiry officer considering those documents can never be sustained in the eye of law and that the findings based on those reasonings cannot be considered as valid and proper to be accepted by this tribunal. The oral testimony of the above said two witnesses relied upon by the Enquiry Officer again deserves to be discarded for the simple reason that their statements have not been corroborated by the statement of Smt. Akkatai based on whose alleged statement/complaint they had deposed before the enquiry officer. Now, coming to the next document taken into consideration by the enquiry officer is the aforesaid credit slip at Ex. ME 3. The only reasoning given by the enquiry officer in this context is that 'had the first party not used the fund and what made him to refund the very said

amount'. It was well argued for the first party that mere remittance of the said amount by the first party cannot lead to an inference that he had utilized or misutilised certain amount towards the loan sanctioned to Smt. Akkatai and therefore, he repaid the said amount along with the interest under the said credit slip. As could be read from the credit slip, the amount was deposited in the SB Account of Smt. Akkatai not against her loan account nor it was the amount deposited with the bank to be kept in suspense account. This payment of Rs. 71,000 and odd again comes under mystery there being no sufficient much less legal evidence being produced by the management to suggest as to what actual amount was due against the loan account of Smt. Akkatai. No ledger sheet is produced evidencing the fact, loan is said to have been sanctioned in the year 1999 and said to have been cleared in August 2001 spreading over a period of 3 years but no single document is produced by the management to show as to what actual amount towards the loan was paid by Smt. Akkatai and what was the due amount outstanding against her as on the date the entire amount was paid under credit slip. That apart, the very charge leveled against the first party that he misutilised the amount of Rs. 30,000 out of Rs. 60,000 loan amount and that the first party was liable to pay to the bank an amount of Rs. 64,955 goes against the very payment made under the said credit slip. When according to the charge sheet he was liable to pay Rs. 64,955 then why he has paid Rs. 71,000 and odd under the said credit slip is yet to be explained by the management. That apart, if we go through the punishment order passed by the disciplinary authority, we find lot of variation on the point that the first party utilized a sum of Rs. 30,000 against the said loan amount. On pages 3 and 4 of the impugned punishment order, the observation made by the disciplinary authority run as under :

"I have carefully gone through his submission. I observe that Shri S. A. Patil, Charge Sheeted Employee himself in his letter dated 21-8-2001 admitted that he was liable to pay to the bank in respect of loan sanctioned to Smt. Akkatai J. Patil. Smt. Akkatai J. Patil also in her letter dated 29-9-2001 categorically stated that Shri S. A. Patil had utilized an amount of Rs. 30,000 out of the loan of Rs. 60,000 and that she has to pay only Rs. 8,000 to the Bank. On a careful perusal of the same, I am of the view that Smt. Akkatai might have paid Rs. 22,000 of the loan of Rs. 30,000 utilized by her to Shri S. A. Patil, but he had not credited the amount to the bank. Consequently, the total amount due from Shri S.A. Patil towards this loan was Rs. 71,070 as on 4-9-2001 on which date he had closed the account. Moreover, I observe that subsequent to his suspension, he had credited Rs. 71,070 to the bank as assured by him. In view

of this, his submission is not acceptable to me, particularly in the context of written submission of Smt. A. J. Patil that Loan proceeds of Rs. 30,000 was utilized by Shri S. A. Patil.

Shri S.A. Patil in his submission stated that he was looking after the affairs of Smt. Akkatai J. Patil. This fact has proved to be incorrect as during the enquiry. It has come to light that Smt. Akkatai J. Patil had paid the loan of Rs. 30,000 utilized by her with Shri S. A. Patil to credit towards loan account long back, but he had not credited the same to the bank. From the letter dated 29-8-2001 given by Smt. Akkatai J. Patil also I find that she had availed only Rs. 30,000 of the loan proceeds, and the balance of Rs. 30,000 was utilized by Shri S. A. Patil. I am, therefore, of the view that Shri S. A. Patil taking advantage of his position in the bank, availed Rs. 60,000 as loan against the requirement of the party of only Rs. 30,000 and utilized Rs. 30,000 for his personal use without crediting the same to the bank. Again, when she paid the amount utilized by her to credit to the bank, he had utilized that amount also for his personal use. The loan was sanctioned on 3-11-1999 and as per the agreement it would have been repaid on or before 31-12-2000. It is, therefore, clear that Shri S. A. Patil utilized even the amount paid by the party for his personal use, which is nothing but a fraudulent act".

12. Therefore, from the aforesaid observations, it is tried to be made out that infact Smt. Akkatai also had paid Rs. 22,000 out of the loan amount of Rs. 30,000 utilized by her to the first party but he did not credit the amount to the bank. That means to say that the first party utilized or misutilised not only Rs. 30,000 but also a sum of Rs. 22,000 which was paid to him by Smt. Akkatai. Then it is not understandable as to why the charge sheet was issued against the first party only in respect of sum of Rs. 30,000 and not for Rs. 52,000 said to have been utilized by him or misutilised by him. Therefore, these being the vital discrepancies with respect of the very figure of the amount said to have been misutilised by the first party much reliance cannot be placed on the aforesaid credit slip at Ex. ME 3 to jump to the conclusion that the first party paid the above said amount with the bank only because he had misutilised the loan amount sanctioned to Smt. Akkatai. It is again not made clear on the part of the management as to what mode or modus operandi was adopted by the first party in misutilising the loan amount sanctioned in favour of Smt. Akkatai. It is not disputed that the loan amount was released in two instalments of Rs. 40,000 and Rs. 20,000. It is a known procedure of law more so being observed by the banking institution that second instalment will not be released unless the first instalment amount was utilized properly and

perfectly and for the purpose the loan was sanctioned. Therefore, when the bank released the second instalment of Rs. 20,000, then one must presume that the bank authorities had satisfied themselves about the proper utilization of the first instalment of loan amount Rs. 40,000 as otherwise second instalment could not have been released. It is strange to note that both MW1 as well as MW2 in their cross examination on behalf of first party were to admit that they have not ensured the utilization rather the unutilization of the loan amount and the reason given by MW2 who was supposed to oversee the loan transaction of the nature in question says that he could not ensure the unutilisation of the loan amount on account of heavy work. It was well argued for the first party that MW1 and 2 having failed to discharge their official duties properly in releasing the loan amount in favour of Smt. Akkatai and in order to save their own skin, on one fine morning i.e. on 21-8-2001 came into action bringing the so-called complaint at Ex.ME5 in picture and then issuing the charge sheet against the first party. Therefore, in the light of the aforesaid observation, this court is of the considered view that the findings of the enquiry officer are not based on sufficient and legal evidence and therefore, suffered from perversity. In the result, the punishment order against the first party having been passed basing on the aforesaid findings are liable to be quashed as illegal and unjustified.

13. As the findings as well as the impugned punishment order against the first party are held to be illegal and unjustified then the natural corollary would be his reinstatement in service.

14. Now, coming to the question of back wages. The first party has not entered into witness box to testify to the effect he has not been gainfully employed during the period he was away from the service of the management. Although a primary burden in order to deny the relief of back wages to the first party was cast upon the management to show that he has been gainfully employed and that has not been discharged by the management. However, in the absence of the evidence of the first party on the point, it cannot safely be held that he has not been gainfully employed when he was out of the service of the management, at least to earn his livelihood not idling himself all along. Therefore, keeping in view the latches both on the part of the management as well as on the part of the first party on the point of gainful employment, it appears to me that ends of justice will be met, if the first party is paid 50% on the back wages from the date of his removal from service till the date of his reinstatement subject to the payment he had already received by way of service benefits in pursuance to the impugned punishment order along with other consequential benefits. Hence the following award :

AWARD

The management is directed to reinstate the first party workman into its services with 50% of the back wages from the date of the impugned punishment order till the date of his reinstatement, subject to any payment made to him already, by way of service benefits in pursuance to the impugned punishment order, along with continuity of service and all other consequential benefits. No costs.

(Dictated to PA transcribed by her corrected and signed by me on 23rd January, 2008)

A.R. SIDDIQUI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 फरवरी, 2008

का. आ. 462.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार साऊथ सेन्ट्रल रेलवे के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, बंगलौर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 33/2005) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-02-2008 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-41012/141/2004-आई आर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 12th February, 2008

S.O. 462.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 33/2005) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Bangalore as shown in the Annexure in Industrial Dispute between the management of South Western Railway, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 12-2-2008.

[No. L-41012/141/2004-IR (B-1)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, BANGALORE

Dated 22nd January, 2008

PRESENT :

Shri A. R. Siddiqui, Presiding Officer

C.R. No. 33/2005

I PARTY

Shri Bandi Chinna Kotaiah,
Railway Senior Trackman,
C/o. Gateman,
Nagarhalli Railway Gate,
P.O. Nagarhalli,
Khanapur Taluka, Distt. Balgaum,
BELGAUM

II PARTY

The Divisional Railway Manager,
South Western Railway,
Divisional Office, Personnel Branch,
HUBLI

AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section 2A of the Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide order No. L-41012/141/2004-IR (B-I) dated 27th July, 2005 for adjudication on the following schedule :

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of South Western Railway Management is not considering the seniority of Shri Bandi Chinna Kotaiah is justified ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to ?”

2. The case of the first party workman as made out in the Claim Statement, relevant for the purpose, in brief, is that he made several representations to the management to absorb him in Mechanical Department but the management refused to take him in the said department on the pretext that only some suitable candidates were taken to Mechanical Department from the Engineering Department. Whereas, the management has never mentioned the nature of suitability and unsuitability for absorbing the candidate from Engineering Department to Mechanical Department. Much less, the first party was not made known about his non-suitability for the claim; that the management has not made out any good reasons for absorbing the 25 candidates vide empanelled list dated 08-11-1991 of the Divisional Office, Personnel Branch, Hubli in No. H/407/IV/C&W/Sub/Vol-VI while not considering the case of the first party; that the management in continuation of his harassment and to deprive him of the legal benefits, purposely, did not consider his case during the year 1991, when 450 candidates were absorbed; that the above said 25 candidates who never worked with the management are enjoying the benefits of the seniority and other benefits and whereas, the first party though worked honestly from the date of his initial appointment has not been given any benefit of seniority or other various benefits for which he is legally entitled to. Therefore, he requested this tribunal to pass an award allowing the reference in his favour with a direction to the management to consider his seniority from the date of initial appointment i.e. w.e.f. 07-08-1982 in the interest of justice.

3. The management by its counter statement, first of all, took up the contention that the reference on hand is not maintainable for want of jurisdiction as there is absolutely no industrial dispute existing for adjudication keeping in view the nature of the relief sought for. While,

coming to the merits, the management contended that the first party joined its services as a casual labourer and his services were regularised by the management as gangman on 31-01-2002. The management contended that the first party has no locus standi to question the above said empanelled list dated 08-11-1991 as the candidates involved therein were deployed to Mechanical Department from the Engineering Department being found suitable and accordingly, were absorbed in order to extent and the number of days they worked and against the vacancies available in the Mechanical Department. Therefore, the first party cannot claim comparison with the aforesaid candidates who are working in the mechanical department particularly, when the aforesaid candidates are not before this tribunal; the management contended that it engaged the services of the first party in the year 1982 as a casual labourer for a period of 14½ days for construction of Doodsagar Bridge between 1-08-1982 and 19-09-1982 and thereafter the first party was never engaged upto the period of 1987 and whereas, in the year 1987 in view of letter dated 14-09-1987 issued by the General Manager, Secunderabad of the management had engaged casual labourers who had earlier worked with the management and accordingly, the first party was engaged as a casual labourer for a further period of 33 days from 19-09-1989 to 31-10-1989 and 25-03-1990 to 17-06-1990 for 84 days and again from 1-03-1991 to 30-09-1991 for a period of 113 days and his name was not taken on live register as he was engaged on daily wages basis; that thereafter the first party was not engaged till 1998. However, on the receipt of instructions from the Railway Board, the management absorbed the casual labourers duly updating their live register against the vacancies and accordingly the first party was absorbed as Jr. Trackman on 31-01-2002. Therefore, the contention of the first party that he was overlooked for promotion is baseless; that the management further contended that at no point of time the management harassed the first party or that the management did not consider his case during the year 1991 when 450 candidates were absorbed. The management also denied the allegation of the first party that his case was not considered at the time of appointment of the aforesaid 25 candidates whose identity also has not been disclosed by the first party. Therefore, the management requested this tribunal to reject the reference.

4. During the course of trial, the management examined one Mr. S. Krishnaji Rao said to have been working as Assistant Personnel Officer, South Western Railway, Hubli by filing his affidavit wherein, he just reiterated the various contentions taken by the management in its Counter Statement. In his further examination chief, attendance register/muster roll for the period between 16-01-1991 and 15-09-1991 was marked at Ex. M1. In his cross-examination he was confronted with a circular dated 8-11-1991 to be marked as Ex. W1

(the above said empanelled list). It was elicited that live register will be on the basis of records maintained by the management including LTI register and the actual working days of the workmen concerned. It was also elicited that casual labour card also will be looked into at that time. He was unable to say as to whether the LTI register is with the management and the names of the aforesaid 25 persons mentioned in Ex. W1 are found mentioned in the Live Register. It was further elicited that the first party worked about 115 days in the year 1991 i.e. below 120 days as per Ex. M1 (attendance register). He (MW1) denied the suggestion that as per Ex. M1 the first party worked for more than 120 days in the year 1991. It was elicited that the absence of the first party from the work shown as without pay as per Ex. M1 for the period of 16-05-1991 to 15-06-1991 has not been considered as on duty. It was elicited that the case of the first party was not considered when the cases of 450 employees were considered for the purpose of regularisation. He denied the suggestion that the aforesaid 25 persons vide Ex. W1 were not at all the employees of the management but they were considered for promotion just to deny the promotion for the first party.

5. The first party also filed his affidavit evidence reiterating the aforesaid averments in the claim statement. In his cross-examination it was elicited that he had no document to show that he was appointed as a casual labourer at any time but added to say that he has produced a document at Ex. W1 to show that juniors to him have been placed above him in seniority list. He denied the suggestion that Ex. W1 is nothing to do with his service in any way and that he was not denied any promotion and that his claim is false.

6. On behalf of the first party, a witness by name Shri T. Koteswara Rao said to be the retired office superintendent, was examined to speak to the fact that the first party was working with the management while he was working as office Superintendent, as a casual labourer in Doodsagar Project in the year 1982. He stated that the other labourers who were working at the said project were made permanent as Khalasi and whereas, the first party's services were not absorbed on permanent basis in the year 1991 despite the several representations made by him. He further stated that in the 1991 itself, about 450 candidates were taken into service by the management as casual labourers but the case of the first party was not considered. He also stated that 25 employees who are named in Ex. W1 were not at all the labourers working under the management and they were given the appointment and were promoted later on placing them above the first party. In his cross-examination it was elicited that there is no document to his knowledge about the appointment of aforesaid 450 labourers. He agreed to the suggestion that as per the Rules and Regulations of

the Railway Management, the seniority of the employee will be considered only after he was made permanent in service and that first party was regularised in service in the year 2001. It was elicited that he did not come across any document or papers about the denial of the seniority to the first party subsequent to his appointment on permanent basis.

7. Learned counsel for the first party, coming to the legal question raised by the management about the maintainability of the present reference before this tribunal, took the court through the provisions of Section 2K of the ID Act and submitted that the present dispute is maintainable as an Industrial Dispute, It being the dispute between the employee and the employer. While, coming to the merits of the case, learned counsel submitted that the case of the first party has not been considered for the purpose of regularization of his services on the ground that he did not work for a period of about 120 days and whereas, as per Ex. M1, the attendance register and from the statement of MW1 it can be made out that the service of the first party for a period of one month i.e. in between 16-05-1991 and 15-06-1991 has not at all been considered as on duty but has been treated as a period of leave without pay. He contended that as per Ex. M1 the first party was in the service of the management and the above said period of about one month between 16-05-1991 and 15-06-1991 should have been considered and he should have been absorbed in service along with the aforesaid 25 persons found in the aforesaid empanelled list at Ex. W1.

8. Whereas, learned counsel for the management first of all argued that the present reference is not maintainable as the case of the first party was not espoused either by the employees union or by the majority of the employees union nor the aforesaid 25 persons have been made parties to the present reference. In this context he relied upon a decision of our Hon'ble High Court reported in ILR 2004 Kar 2841. In the aforesaid decision also the dispute was with respect to the denial of promotion to the individual concerned. At Para 7, of the decision the Hon'ble High Court observed as under :—

“The reference to workmen in Section 2(K) of the Act excludes in the application an individual dispute, as distinguished from a dispute involving a group of workmen unless the individual dispute is made a common cause by a body or a considerable section of workmen. There is no dispute about the fact that the dispute herein is a dispute between an individual and the employers and the dispute is regarding his promotion. It is difficult to comprehend that such a dispute directly and substantially affects the interest of the other workmen so as to be regarded as projecting their common cause. The individual dispute to be

converted into an industrial dispute it should be taken up by the Union or by an appreciable number of employees which is not the case herein.”

9. In the instant case also as could be seen from the points of reference the matter pertains to the alleged denial of the seniority/promotion to the first party. Undisputedly, it is not a dispute taken up by the union or by an appreciable number of employees. There is again no dispute of the fact that the dispute on hand directly and substantially affects the interest of other workmen so as to be regarded as projecting their common cause. On the other hand the aforesaid 25 persons named in Ex. W1 whose interests likely to be affected in case relief asked for by the first party is granted, are not before this tribunal. Therefore, on both the counts as argued for the management, the dispute in hand is not maintainable.

10. Now, coming to the merits of the case. Undisputedly, the first party had been working with the management as a casual labourer for few days during the year 1982, for few days in the year 1991 and his services have been absorbed by the management on regular basis in the year 2002. Now, as per the points of dispute, the management is called upon to show as to whether it was justified in denying the seniority to the first party. First of all it is not made clear as to on what basis and against whom actually the first party is claiming his seniority. What could be made out from the averments in his claim statement and what the first party wanted to say is that his case should have been considered in the year 1991 itself, when the services of the aforesaid 25 persons named in Ex. W1 came to be absorbed by the management. His contention was that these 25 persons were not at all in the services of the management at the relevant point of time, which contention is liable to be rejected on its face itself, as the very reading of Ex. W1 will make it abundantly clear that those were the workers on the roll of the management as per the aforesaid empanelled list. Now, assuming for a moment that these workmen were not working under the management, the next question to be considered would be whether the first party as of right can claim any seniority as against those persons when he was undisputedly working as a casual labourer and was not in the services of the management on permanent basis at the relevant point of time. The answer to the said question must be in the negative. The relief pertaining to seniority or promotion as was well argued for the management could have been claimed when an employee is already in the permanent service of the management and when his seniority was not considered as against the other permanent employees working under the management. In the instant case admittedly, the services of the first party have been regularized only in the year 2002 and it is not the case of the first party that it is thereafter his seniority has not been considered or that

his juniors have been promoted ignoring his seniority. As could be read from the aforesaid contentions taken by the first party, he has got the grievance as against the aforesaid 25 persons named in Ex. W1. He has not challenged the aforesaid circular/empanelled list absorbing the services of the above said 25 persons on the ground that their absorption in service resulted into denial of his seniority. He obviously could not have challenged the aforesaid order of absorption by the management as undisputedly, he was not in the permanent services of the management at the relevant point of time. Therefore, without challenging the aforesaid order absorbing the services of the above said 25 persons on any ground much less on the ground that his case was not considered for the absorption purpose he could not have raised any dispute with the management claiming any kind of seniority as against those persons particularly, when they are not before this tribunal. In this context it will be interesting to take into account the very statement of WW2, the witness for the first party as brought out in his cross-examination. As noted above, he was to admit that as per the Rules and Regulations of the Railway management it is after the employee is made permanent, question of his seniority will be considered. Therefore, when the first party was not at all in the services of the management on permanent basis, he could not have claimed any right of seniority as against the aforesaid 25 persons named in Ex. W1. The next contention of the first party which was brought out only during the course of cross-examination of management witness was that a period of 120 days service was considered in respect of the above said 25 persons while absorbing their services but the service of the first party was not considered on the ground that he worked only for a period of 115 days. In this connection as noted above, it was also brought out in the statement of MW1 that for the period in between 16-05-1991 and 15-06-1991, services of the first party were treated as leave without pay as he was absent from duty for the said period. Learned counsel for the first party wanted to say that this period of absence from duty also could have been taken as on duty while considering his case along with aforesaid 25 persons. I am unable to agree with this submission of the learned counsel for the first party as he worked with the management only as a casual worker and his service to be considered for the above said purpose must be the actual working days and not for the days he was absent from duty. If a casual worker remained absent from duty for a particular day, certainly that day of absence cannot be considered for the purpose of his services. In the result and the foregoing reasons, I am of the considered view that the first party has miserably failed to make out a case before this tribunal that there was any injustice caused to him by the management in denying him any seniority or any promotion as against the aforesaid 25 workers named in Ex. W1. Hence the following Award :

AWARD

The reference is rejected. No costs.

(Dictated to PA transcribed by her corrected and signed by me on 22nd January, 2008)

A. R. SIDDIQUI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 फरवरी, 2008

का.आ. 463.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार तुंगभद्रा ग्रामीण बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, बंगलौर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 252/1997) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-02-2008 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/112/1996-आई आर (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 12th February, 2008

S.O. 463.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 252/1997) of Central Government Industrial Tribunal-Cum-Labour Court, Bangalore as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Tungabhadra Grameena Bank, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 12-02-2008.

[No. L-12012/112/1996-IR(B-1)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR
COURT, BANGALORE**

Dated : 16th January, 2008

PRESENT

Shri A. R. Siddiqui, Presiding Officer

C. R. No. 252/1997

I PARTY

Shri P. Shivaram,
C/o Tungabhadra Grameena
Bank Employees Union,
144, Kappagal Road,
BELLARY
KARNATAKA STATE

II PARTY

The Chairman,
Tungabhadra Grameena
Bank, Head Office,
Sanganakal Road,
Gandhinagar, BELLARY
KARNATAKA STATE

AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section 2A of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide order No. L-12012/112/96-IR(B1) dated 14th July, 1997 for adjudication on the following schedule :

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Tungabhadra Grameena Bank, Vellary in terminating the services of Shri P. Shivaram is legal and justified ? If so, to what relief the workman is entitled ?”

2. A charge sheet dated 22-08-1989 came to be served upon the first party workman on the allegation that during the period from 2-11-1987 to 4-07-1989, he availed leave 18 times aggregating to 353 days, out of which 8 times aggregating to 161 days remaining absent from duty without sanctions. He admitted his lapses vide his letters dated 13-10-1988 and 23-05-1989 assuming the bank to abide by leave rules in future. In spite of that he continued to remain absent frequently without prior permission/sanction and without adhering to leave rules in violation of Regulation 30(1) of Staff Regulations thereby, causing hindrance and obstruction in the smooth functioning of the bank.

3. The Second charge sheet dated 19-07-1990 again was served upon the first party alleging first charge that he was remaining absent from duty from 05-09-1989. He sought leave on medical grounds from 05-09-1989 to 30-09-1989 without submitting any medical certificate and got the leave extended till 02-11-1989 without submitting any application. Even while joining duty on 03-11-1989 he did not submit leave application or fitness certificate. Under the Second charge it was alleged that he remained absent from duty from 4-12-1989 without submitting leave application and submitted leave application along with medical certificate only on 20-12-1989 seeking leave up to 30-12-1989. Under the 3rd charge it was alleged that the first party was examined by bank's Doctor on 16-01-1990 at Bellary and as per the doctor's opinion his health condition did not warrant medical leave for more than two or three weeks. He again sought leave on medical ground and remained absent undisputedly from duty from 31-01-1990 to 12-04-1990. He submitted leave application only on 20-02-1990 seeking leave from 1-02-1990 to 10-03-1990 and sent a telegram to the branch seeking leave upto 20th February on the ground that his mother was serious. He then submitted leave application on 11-03-1990 extending leave from 12-03-1990 to 21-04-1990 received by the branch on 31-03-1990 and that the medical certificate submitted by him was not complete. As against Charge No. 4 once again he was charge sheeted on the allegation that while working at Jagarkal branch he remained unauthorisedly absent from duty from 05-09-1989 to 02-11-1989 and thereby violated leave rules and disobeyed lawful and reasonable orders by not complying with the orders to report back for work. Thereupon, as could be read from the records in respect of the aforesaid two charge sheets, Domestic Enquiries were ordered against the first party with due notice of

enquiry and after conclusion of the enquiry proceedings common enquiry findings were submitted holding the first party guilty of the aforesaid charges of misconduct. He was served with the copy of the findings along with show cause notice dated 22-11-1990 proposing the punishment of 'removal from service' and there being no response from the first party to the said show cause notice, the disciplinary authority while accepting the findings confirmed the above said punishment by impugned punishment order dated 14-12-1990. The first party preferred an appeal against the punishment order and it being rejected, the decision of the board was communicated to him vide letter dated 11-02-1991. Thereupon, the first party appears to have raised the dispute with the conciliation authority concerned resulting into the present reference proceedings.

4. The first party in his Claim Statement, while, referring to the above said two charge sheets and the allegations made therein came out with the case that initially he was appointed as a Part time Messenger on daily wage basis on 1-09-1984 and his services came to be regularized by the bank vide order dated 24-10-1987 and thereafter he was working in the bank honestly with utmost integrity. At Para 8 of the claim statement his contention was that the enquiry was commenced on 29-08-1990 but he was not explained with the procedure of the enquiry nor was told about his right to take the assistance of a co-employee or a legal practitioner. The enquiry officer assured him that if he admits the charge he will be given minor punishment without losing the job. Therefore, without realizing the consequences of the admissions, he admitted the charge. Coming to the merits of the case he contended that he submitted medical certificates in respect of all the charges and that his leave applications were always supported by medical certificate; that the bank did not refer him for medical board on all occasions except on 16-01-1990 when the board felt that from 16-01-1990 he should be on medical leave for a period of 2 or 3 weeks i.e. still the first week of February 1990. However, he requested for medical leave even thereafter and therefore the action of the bank in rejecting the medical certificate without referring to the medical board was illegal and contrary to law. He then challenged the impugned punishment order as disproportionate to the charges leveled against him and that the Disciplinary Authority or the Appellate Authority did not consider the gravity of the charges while imposing the punishment. Lastly, he contended that he was discharging his duties from 1984 to 1989 without any allegation against him about his irregularity and it is only in the year 1989 he was absent for some period and that it was due to his ill health, which was proved by producing the medical evidence. Therefore, he requested this tribunal to set aside the dismissal order answering the reference in his favour with all consequential benefits.

5. The case of the Management as made out in the counter statement to put in nut shell is that on the aforesaid two charge sheets, Domestic Enquiries were conducted against the first party by giving him sufficient and reasonable opportunity to defend himself. The management contended that as against the charge sheet dated 22-08-1989, first sitting was held on 15-03-1990 and the first party after having attended the same denied the charges. However, he admitted the charges voluntarily and unconditionally during the course of enquiry and it is on the basis of the admission made by the first party and in the light of the documents and the oral evidence produced by the management, the enquiry officer found him guilty of the charges leveled against him on the first charge sheet. Management, then, contended that in respect of the second charge sheet dated 19-07-1990, first sitting of the enquiry was held on 29-08-1990 on which date the first party at the commencement of the enquiry itself, admitted the charges and it is based on his admission as well as the documentary evidence produced during the course of enquiry he was held guilty of the charges leveled in the said charge sheet. The management contended that the disciplinary authority after having accepted the findings on both the charge sheets issued show cause notice dated 22-11-1990 proposing the punishment of removal from service. The first party though received the same on 11-12-1990 failed to make any representation against the proposed penalty and therefore, having taken into consideration the relevant materials on record and the gravity of the misconduct, the Disciplinary Authority confirmed the above said proposed punishment by order dated 14-12-1990 and the appeal preferred by the first party against the said order came to be dismissed by communication dated 11-02-1991. The management at para 10 further contended that the first party was found to be absenting unauthorisedly from duty every now and then for a long periods even before issuing the present two charge sheets and he did not mend himself despite the several warnings given to him. He did not show any improvement in his attendance even during the period charge sheets were pending against him. He remained absent from duty from 2-11-1987 to 24-12-1990 i.e. in a matter of 3 years. He remained absent on 27 occasions and absented for 619 days without having leave to his credit. Therefore, having regard to the gravity of the misconduct committed by him the impugned punishment order awarded against him was quite legal and justified not to be interfered at the hands of this tribunal.

6. Keeping in view the respective contentions of the parties with regard to the validity and fairness or otherwise of the enquiry proceedings this tribunal on 24-01-2007 framed the following Preliminary Issue :—

"Whether the Domestic Enquiry conducted against the first party by the second party is fair and proper?"

7. During the course of trial of the said issue the management examined the enquiry officer as MW1 and got marked 14 documents at Ex M1 to M14 in his examination chief. On 5-09-2007 MW1 came to be discharged there being no representation on behalf of the first party and the case came to be posted for his evidence. On 1-10-2007, learned counsel for the first party filed a memo conceding the proceedings of the DE and therefore, the Domestic Enquiry conducted against the first party was held to be fair and proper and the matter came to be posted to hear the learned counsels on merits. Both the parties through their counsels have filed there written arguments and the learned counsel for the management relied upon the following 5 decisions on the point as to how and why the punishment order passed against the first party is justified under the facts and circumstances of the case.

1. 2004-III LLJ 543 (SC)
2. 2006-II LLJ 865 SC
3. 2005-III LLJ 815 (Kar)
4. 2005-II LLJ 507(AP)
5. 2007-I LLJ 933(Delhi)

8. Now, therefore, in the light of the findings recorded by this tribunal to the effect that the Domestic Enquiries conducted against the first party on the aforesaid two charge sheets were fair and proper, the only two important questions now to be considered would be whether the enquiry findings suffered from perversity and if not, the impugned punishment order was disproportionate to the gravity of the misconduct committed by the first party.

9. From the reading of the proceedings of the enquiry conducted in both the charge sheets and the common findings of the enquiry officer submitted on both the charge sheets, it can be gathered that on the first sitting of the enquiry held on 15-03-1990 against the charge sheet dated 22-8-1989, the first party was read over with the charges and he after having understood the same denied those charges. The enquiry came to be adjourned giving an opportunity to the first party to take the assistance of DR to defend himself. One Mr. Basavarajapunyamurthy was permitted to defend the first party as his DR. Thereafter, as many as 53 documents were marked on behalf of the management and in the course of the enquiry. During the 4th sitting two witnesses as MW1 and 2 were examined on behalf of the management and in the 5th sitting held on 29-08-1990 the first party admitted the charges voluntarily and unconditionally and thereupon, on the basis of the said documentary as well as oral evidence and the admission of the first party findings were submitted holding him guilty of the aforesaid charge vide charge sheet dated 22-08-1989. From the reading of the

proceedings conducted on the second charge sheet dated 19-7-1990 it can be seen that on the very first sitting of the enquiry the first party admitted the charges submitting his no objections for marking the documents produced on behalf of the management at Ex. MEX 1 to 41 and it is on the conclusion of the aforesaid enquiry proceedings, the enquiry officer submitted his findings common in both the charge sheets holding the first party guilty of the aforesaid charges and thereupon, as noted above, the first party was served with enquiry findings being proposed with the punishment of removal from service and ultimately the proposed punishment was confirmed being upheld by the Appellate Authority and then the dispute being raised before the Conciliation Officer, the reference is before this tribunal.

10. Learned counsel for the first party in his written argument except to reiterate the various contentions/averments made in the claim statement before this tribunal added nothing in challenging the enquiry findings. Once again the contention raised on behalf of the first party by way of the argument was that he had admitted the charges being given assurance by the enquiry officer that he will be dealt with a minor punishment in case, he admitted the charges. The next argument was to the effect that the Disciplinary Authority did not take into consideration the gravity of the charge while imposing the punishment particularly, in view of the fact that on all most all the occasions for having remained absent from duty, the first party has submitted his leave applications along with the medical certificates.

11. Whereas, learned counsel for the management by his written argument reiterating the various contentions taken by the management in its counter statement, referred to the above said decisions in order to justify the punishment awarded to the first party.

12. After having gone through the findings of the enquiry officer coupled with the evidence brought on record during the course of enquiry and the fact undisputed by the first party even by way of his claim statement that he had admitted the charges leveled against him, I find no legal or factual defects with the findings of the enquiry officer in holding the first party guilty of the charges leveled against him. The contention of the first party that he admitted the charges on the assurance given by the enquiry officer that a lenient view will be taken against him if he admitted the charges cannot be accepted as it was not substantiated by any evidence before this tribunal much less the first party himself did not come forward to give his statement before this tribunal either on the point of the Domestic Enquiry or to meet the case of the management that he admitted the charges voluntarily during the course of enquiry held against him. That apart, the enquiry officer has not only relied upon the admissions of guilt made by the first party but also the voluminous

documentary evidence and the oral evidence produced by the management during the course of enquiry in coming to the conclusion that charges of misconduct of unauthorised absence were proved against the first party. Infact, from the reading of the various averments made by the first party in his Claim Statement, it can be very well gathered that the first party did not follow the leave rules in remaining absent from duty, unauthorisedly. As could be read from the counter statement of the second party that application for Privilege Leave shall ordinarily be submitted by the officer or employee at least one month before the date from which leave is required and such a leave cannot be availed for more than three times in a year. Similarly, for availing sick leave on grounds of sickness as per the Regulation, the employee concerned is supposed to submit his medical certificate acceptable to the bank. In the instant case as noted above, as could be read from the findings of the enquiry officer and from the very averments made in the claim statements, the first party did not take prior permission/sanction from the competent authority before remaining absent over long periods nor he submitted the leave applications along with medical certificates much less fitness certificates as provided under the rules. Therefore, the charges of misconduct leveled against the first party under the aforesaid two charge sheets have been proved by sufficient and legal evidence and in the result, the enquiry findings are held to be fair and proper not to be interfered at the hands of this tribunal.

13. Now, coming to the question of quantum of the punishment. The principle laid down by their Lordship of various High Courts and Supreme Court in the decisions referred to *supra* and cited on behalf of the management certainly support the arguments advanced for the management that having regard to the fact that the first party remained absent from duty for such a long period that too in the beginning of his service period itself, the punishment of removal cannot be said to be shockingly disproportionate. However, in my opinion there are certain mitigating circumstances in favour of the first party to be taken into consideration while dealing with the question of punishment. It is not disputed by the management as could be read from the counter statement that for the period

of absence alleged against the first party under the second charge sheet dated 19-07-1990, the first party had been submitting the leave applications as well as the medical certificates though not in accordance with the rules. He has not followed leave rules very strictly, and at the same time was not quite indifferent, altogether. The next mitigating circumstance in his favour is the fact that he has come into trouble for having committed the misconduct of unauthorised absence at the earliest point of his service. As seen above, he was regularized in service as a Messenger w.e.f. 02-11-1987 and during the period of 3 years from the aforesaid date he remained unauthorisedly absent from duty on as many as 18 occasions, of course against the leave applications as well as the medical certificates but not submitted as provided under the rules. Therefore, the first party was in the service of the management only for a period of 3 years with a very long and prospective future, the management in my opinion could not have resorted to the extreme punishment of removal from service, itself, without giving him one more opportunity to mend his ways in future. It is to be noted that the first party is a Class IV servant, working as a Messenger, not expected of knowing the service rules in their strict terms. Therefore, having regard to the aforesaid factors, the facts and circumstances of the case, it appears to me that ends of justice will be met, if the first party is given one more opportunity to reform himself giving him relief of reinstatement as a fresh candidate, denying him almost all the service benefits including continuity of service, back wages etc. hence the following award :

AWARD

The management is directed to reinstate the first party into its services as a fresh candidate putting him on fresh probation as it deems fit. The first party shall not be entitled to any service benefits much less continuity of service, back wages etc. No costs.

(Dictated to PA transcribed by her corrected and signed by me on 16th January, 2008).

A. R. SIDDIQUI, Presiding Officer